Chapter 9

Concurrency Control

Interactions among transactions can cause the database state to become inconsistent, even when the transactions individually preserve correctness of the state, and there is no system failure. Thus, the order in which the individual steps of different transactions occur needs to be regulated in some manner. The function of controlling these steps is given to the scheduler component of the DBMS, and the general process of assuring that transactions preserve consistency when executing simultaneously is called concurrency control. The role of the scheduler is suggested by Fig. 9.1.

As transactions request reads and writes of database elements, these requests are passed to the scheduler. In most situations, the scheduler will execute the reads and writes directly, first calling on the buffer manager if the desired database element is not in a buffer. However, in some situations, it is not safe for the request to be executed immediately. The scheduler must delay the
request; in some concurrency-control techniques, the scheduler may even abort the transaction that issued the request.

We begin by studying how to assure that concurrently executing transactions preserve correctness of the database state. The abstract requirement is called serializability, and there is an important, stronger condition called conflict-serializability that most schedulers actually enforce. We consider the most important techniques for implementing schedulers: locking, timestamping, and validation.

Our study of lock-based schedulers includes the important concept of "two-phase locking," which is a requirement widely used to assure serializability of schedules. We also find that there are many different sets of lock modes that a scheduler can use, each with a different application. Among the locking schemes we study are those for nested and tree-structured collections of lockable elements.

### 9.1 Serial and Serializable Schedules

To begin our study of concurrency control, we must examine the conditions under which a collection of concurrently executing transactions will preserve consistency of the database state. Our fundamental assumption, which we called the "correctness principle" in Section 8.1.3, is: every transaction, if executed in isolation (without any other transactions running concurrently), will transform any consistent state to another consistent state. However, in practice, transactions often run concurrently with other transactions, so the correctness principle doesn't apply directly. Thus, we need to consider "schedules" of actions that can be guaranteed to produce the same result as if the transactions executed one-at-a-time. The major theme of this entire chapter is methods for forcing transactions to execute concurrently only in ways that make them appear to run one-at-a-time.

#### 9.1.1 Schedules

A schedule is a time-ordered sequence of the important actions taken by one or more transactions. When studying concurrency control, the important read and write actions take place in the main-memory buffers, not the disk. That is, a database element A that is brought to a buffer by some transaction T may be read or written in that buffer not only by T but by other transactions that access A. Recall from Section 8.1.4 that the READ and WRITE actions first call INPUT to get a database element from disk if it is not already in a buffer, but otherwise READ and WRITE actions access the element in the buffer directly. Thus, only the READ and WRITE actions, and their orders, are important when considering concurrency, and we shall ignore the INPUT and OUTPUT actions.

**Example 9.1**: Let us consider two transactions and the effect on the database when their actions are executed in certain orders. The important actions of the
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transactions $T_1$ and $T_2$ are shown in Fig. 9.2. The variables $t$ and $s$ are local variables of $J_1$ and $J_2$, respectively; they are not database elements.

We shall assume that the only consistency constraint on the database state is that $A = B$. Since $J_1$ adds 100 to both $A$ and $B$, and $J_2$ multiplies both $A$ and $B$ by 2, we know that each transaction, run in isolation, will preserve consistency.

![Figure 9.2: Two transactions](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th>$A$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ(A,t)</td>
<td>READ(A,s)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t := t + 100$</td>
<td>$s := s^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITE(A,t)</td>
<td>WRITE(A,s)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ(B,t)</td>
<td>WRITE(B,t)</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t := t + 100$</td>
<td>WRITE(B,s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s := s^2$</td>
<td>WRITE(B,s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.3: Serial schedule in which $J_1$ precedes $T_2$

9.1.2 Serial Schedules

We say a schedule is serial if its actions consist of all the actions of one transaction, then all the actions of another transaction, and so on, with no mixing of the actions. More precisely, a schedule $S$ is serial if for any two transactions $T$ and $T'$, if any action of $T$ precedes any action of $T'$, then all actions of $T$ precede all actions of $T'$.
Example 9.2: For the transactions of Fig. 9.2, there are two serial schedules, one in which $T_1$ precedes $T_2$ and the other in which $T_2$ precedes $T_1$. Figure 9.3 shows the sequence of events when $T_1$ precedes $T_2$, and the initial state is $A = B = 25$. We shall take the convention that when displayed vertically, time proceeds down the page. Also, the values of $A$ and $B$ shown refer to their values in main-memory buffers, not necessarily to their values on disk.

Then, Fig. 9.4 shows another serial schedule in which $T_2$ precedes $T_1$; the initial state is again assumed to be $A = B = 25$. Notice that the final values of $A$ and $B$ are different for the two schedules; they both have value 250 when $T_1$ goes first and 150 when $T_2$ goes first. However, the final result is not the central issue, as long as consistency is preserved. In general, we would not expect the final state of a database to be independent of the order of transactions.

We can represent a serial schedule as in Fig. 9.3 or Fig. 9.4, listing each of the actions in the order they occur. However, since the order of actions in a serial schedule depends only on the order of the transactions themselves, we shall sometimes represent a serial schedule by the list of transactions. Thus, the schedule of Fig. 9.3 is represented $(T_1, T_2)$, and that of Fig. 9.4 is $(T_2, T_1)$.

### 9.1.3 Serializable Schedules

The correctness principle for transactions tells us that every serial schedule will preserve consistency of the database state. But are there any other schedules that also are guaranteed to preserve consistency? There are, as the following example shows. In general, we say a schedule is *serializable if* its effect on the database state is the same as that of some serial schedule, regardless of what the initial state of the database is.
Example 9.3: Figure 9.5 shows a schedule of the transactions from Example 9.1 that is serializable but not serial. In this schedule, \( T_2 \) acts on \( A \) after \( T_1 \) does, but before \( T_1 \) acts on \( B \). However, we see that the effect of the two transactions scheduled in this manner is the same as for the serial schedule \((T_1, T_2)\) that we saw in Fig. 9.3. To convince ourselves of the truth of this statement, we must consider not only the effect from the database state \( A = B = 25 \), which we show in Fig. 9.5, but from any consistent database state. Since all consistent database states have \( A - B = c \) for some constant \( c \), it is not hard to deduce that in the schedule of Fig. 9.5, both \( A \) and \( B \) will be left with the value \( 2(c + 100) \), and thus consistency is preserved from any consistent state.

On the other hand, consider the schedule of Fig. 9.6. Clearly it is not serial, but more significantly, it is not serializable. The reason we can be sure it is not serializable is that it takes the consistent state \( A = B = 25 \) and leaves the database in an inconsistent state, where \( A = 250 \) and \( B = 150 \). Notice that in this order of actions, where \( T_1 \) operates on \( A \) first, but \( T_2 \) operates on \( B \) first, we have in effect applied different computations to \( A \) and \( B \), that is \( A := 2(A + 100) \) versus \( B := 2B + 100 \). The schedule of Fig. 9.6 is the sort of behavior that concurrency control mechanisms must avoid. \( \square \)
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### Figure 9.7: A schedule that is serializable only because of the detailed behavior of the transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th>$A$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ(A,t)</td>
<td>READ(A,s)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t := t+100</td>
<td>s := s+2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITE(A,t)</td>
<td>WRITE(A,s)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>READ(B,s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s := s+2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRITE(B,s)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ(B,t)</td>
<td>READ(B,s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t := t+100</td>
<td>s := s+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITE(B,t)</td>
<td>WRITE(B,s)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 9.6: A nonserializable schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th>$A$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ(A,t)</td>
<td>READ(A,s)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t := t+100</td>
<td>s := s+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITE(A,t)</td>
<td>WRITE(A,s)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>READ(B,s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s := s+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WRITE(B,s)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READ(B,t)</td>
<td>READ(B,s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t := t+100</td>
<td>s := s+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITE(B,t)</td>
<td>WRITE(B,s)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 9.4: Consider the schedule of Fig. 9.7, which differs from Fig. 9.6 only in the computation that \( T_2 \) performs. That is, instead of multiplying \( A \) and \( B \) by 2, \( T_2 \) multiplies them by 1.\(^1\) Now, the values of \( A \) and \( B \) at the end of this schedule are equal, and one can easily check that regardless of the consistent initial state, the final state will be consistent. In fact, the final state is the one that results from either of the serial schedules \((T_1,T_2)\) or \((T_2,T_1)\). \(\square\)

Unfortunately, it is not realistic for the scheduler to concern itself with the details of computation undertaken by transactions. Since transactions often involve code written in a general-purpose programming language as well as SQL or other high-level-language statements, it is sometimes very hard to answer questions like "does this transaction multiply \( A \) by a constant other than 1?" However, the scheduler does get to see the read and write requests from the transactions, so it can know what database elements each transaction reads, and what elements it might change. To simplify the job of the scheduler, it is conventional to assume that:

- Any database element \( A \) that a transaction \( T \) writes is given a value that depends on the database state in such a way that no arithmetic coincidences occur.

Put another way, if there is something that \( T \) could have done to \( A \) that will make the database state inconsistent, then \( T \) will do that. We shall make this assumption more precise in Section 9.2, when we talk about sufficient conditions to guarantee serializability.

### 9.1.5 A Notation for Transactions and Schedules

If we accept that the exact computations performed by a transaction can be arbitrary, then we do not need to consider the details of local computation steps such as \( t := t+100 \). Only the reads and writes performed by the transaction matter. Thus, we shall represent transactions and schedules by a shorthand notation, in which the actions are \( r_T(X) \) and \( w_T(X) \), meaning that transaction \( T \) reads, or respectively writes, database element \( X \). Moreover, since we shall usually name our transactions \( T_1, T_2, \ldots \), we adopt the convention that \( r_t(X) \) and \( w_t(X) \) are synonyms for \( r_{T_t}(X) \) and \( w_{T_t}(X) \), respectively.

Example 9.5: The transactions of Fig. 9.2 can be written:

\[
T_1: r_1(A); w_1(A); r_1(B); w_1(B);
\]

\(^1\)One might reasonably ask why a transaction would behave that way, but let us ignore the matter for the sake of an example. In fact, there are many plausible transactions we could substitute for \( T_2 \) that would leave \( A \) and \( B \) unchanged; for instance, \( T_2 \) might simply read \( A \) and \( B \) and print their values. Or, \( T_2 \) might ask the user for some data, compute a factor \( F \) with which to multiply \( A \) and \( B \), and find for some user inputs that \( F = 1 \).
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\[ T_2: r_2(A); w_2(A); r_2(B); w_2(B); \]

Notice that there is no mention of the local variables \( t \) and \( s \) anywhere, and no indication of what has happened to \( A \) and \( B \) after they were read. Intuitively, we shall "assume the worst," regarding the ways in which these database elements change.

As another example, consider the serializable schedule of \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) from Fig. 9.5. This schedule is written:

\[ r_1(A); w_1(A); r_2(A); w_2(A); r_1(B); w_1(B); r_2(B); w_2(B); \]

\[ \square \]

To make the notation precise:

1. An action is an expression of the form \( r_i(X) \) or \( w_i(X) \), meaning that transaction \( T_i \) reads or writes, respectively, the database element \( X \).

2. A transaction \( T_i \) is a sequence of actions with subscript \( i \).

3. A schedule \( S \) of a set of transactions \( T \) is a sequence of actions, in which for each transaction \( T_i \) in \( T \), the actions of \( T_i \) appear in the same order that they appear in the definition of \( T_i \) itself. We say that \( S \) is an interleaving of the actions of the transactions of which it is composed.

For instance, the schedule of Example 9.5 has all the actions with subscript 1 appearing in the same order that they have in the definition of \( T_1 \), and the actions with subscript 2 appear in the same order that they appear in the definition of \( T_2 \).

9.1.6 Exercises for Section 9.1

* Exercise 9.1.1: A transaction \( T_1 \), executed by an airline-reservation system, performs the following steps:

   i. The customer is queried for a desired flight time and cities. Information about the desired flights is located in database elements (perhaps disk blocks) \( A \) and \( B \), which the system retrieves from disk.

   ii. The customer is told about the options, and selects a flight whose data, including the number of reservations for that flight is in \( B \). A reservation on that flight is made for the customer.

   iii. The customer selects a seat for the flight; seat data for the flight is in database element \( C \).

   iv. The system gets the customer’s credit-card number and appends the bill for the flight to a list of bills in database element \( D \).
v. The customer's phone and flight data is added to another list on database element E for a fax to be sent confirming the flight.

Express transaction \( T_1 \) as a sequence of \( r \) and \( w \) actions.

*! Exercise 9.1.2: If two transactions consist of 4 and 6 actions, respectively, how many interleavings of these transactions are there?

9.2 Conflict-Serializability

We shall now develop a condition that is sufficient to assure that a schedule is serializable. Schedulers in commercial systems generally assure this stronger condition, which we shall call "conflict-serializability," when they want to assure that transactions behave in a serializable manner. It is based on the idea of a conflict: a pair of consecutive actions in a schedule such that, if their order is interchanged, then the behavior of at least one of the transactions involved can change.

9.2.1 Conflicts

To begin, let us observe that most pairs of actions do not conflict in the sense above. In what follows, we assume that \( T_i \) and \( T_j \) are different transactions; i.e., \( i \neq j \).

1. \( r_i(X); r_j(Y) \) is never a conflict, even if \( X = Y \). The reason is that neither of these steps change any value.

2. \( r_i(X); w_j(Y) \) is not a conflict provided \( X \neq Y \). The reason is that should \( T_j \) write \( Y \) before \( T_i \) reads \( X \), the value of \( X \) is not changed. Also, the read of \( X \) by \( T_i \) has no effect on \( T_j \), so it does not affect the value \( T_j \) writes for \( Y \).

3. \( w_i(X); r_j(Y) \) is not a conflict if \( X \neq Y \), for the same reason as (2).

4. Also similarly, \( w_i(X); w_j(Y) \) is not a conflict as long as \( X \neq Y \).

On the other hand, there are three situations where we may not swap the order of actions:

a) Two actions of the same transaction, e.g., \( r_i(X); w_i(Y) \), conflict. The reason is that the order of actions of a single transaction are fixed and may not be reordered by the DBMS.

b) Two writes of the same database element by different transactions conflict. That is, \( w_i(X); w_j(X) \) is a conflict. The reason is that as written, the value of \( X \) remains afterward as whatever \( T_j \) computed it to be. If we swap the order, as \( w_j(X); w_i(X) \), then we leave \( X \) with the value computed by
Our assumption of "no coincidences" tells us that the values written by $T_j$ and $T_k$ might be different, and therefore will be different for some initial state of the database.

c) A read and a write of the same database element by different transactions also conflict. That is, $r_j(X); w_k(X)$ is a conflict, and so is $w_j(X); r_k(X)$. If we move $w_j(X)$ ahead of $r_k(X)$, then the value of $X$ read by $T_j$ will be that written by $T_k$, which we assume is not necessarily the same as the previous value of $X$. Thus, swapping the order of $r_j(X)$ and $w_k(X)$ affects the value $T_j$ reads for $X$ and could therefore affect what $T_j$ does.

The conclusion we draw is that any two actions of different transactions may be swapped in order, unless

1. They involve the same database element, and
2. At least one is a write.

Extending this idea, we may take any schedule and make as many nonconflicting swaps as we wish, with the goal of turning the schedule into a serial schedule. If we can do so, then the original schedule is serializable, because its effect on the database state remains the same as we perform each of the nonconflicting swaps.

We say that two schedules are conflict-equivalent if they can be turned one into the other by a sequence of nonconflicting swaps of adjacent actions. We shall call a schedule conflict-serializable if it is conflict-equivalent to a serial schedule. Note that conflict-serializability is a sufficient condition for serializability; i.e., a conflict-serializable schedule is a serializable schedule. Conflict-serializability is not required for a schedule to be serializable, but it is the condition that the schedulers in commercial systems generally use when they need to guarantee serializability.

**Example 9.6**: Consider the schedule

$$r_1(A); w_1(A); r_2(A); w_2(A); r_1(B); w_1(B); r_2(B); w_2(B);$$

from Example 9.5. We claim this schedule is conflict-serializable. Figure 9.8 shows the sequence of swaps in which this schedule is converted to the serial schedule $(T_1, T_2)$, where all of $T_1$’s actions precede all those of $T_2$. We have underlined the pair of adjacent actions about to be swapped at each step.

**9.2.2 Precedence Graphs and a Test for Conflict-Serializability**

It is relatively simple to examine a schedule $S$ and decide whether or not it is conflict-serializable. The idea is that when there are conflicting actions that
Figure 9.8: Converting a conflict-serializable schedule to a serial schedule by swaps of adjacent actions

appear anywhere in $S$, the transactions performing those actions must appear in the same order in any conflict-equivalent serial schedule as the actions appear in $S$. Thus, conflicting pairs of actions put constraints on the order of transactions in the hypothetical, conflict-equivalent serial schedule. If these constraints are not contradictory, we can find a conflict-equivalent serial schedule. If they are contradictory, we know that no such serial schedule exists.

Given a schedule $S$, involving transactions $T_1$ and $T_2$, perhaps among other transactions, we say that $T_1$ takes precedence over $T_2$ written $T_1 <_S T_2$, if there are actions $A_1$ of $T_1$ and $A_2$ of $T_2$, such that:

1. $A_1$ is ahead of $A_2$ in $S$.
2. Both $A_1$ and $A_2$ involve the same database element, and
3. At least one of $A_1$ and $A_2$ is a write action.

Notice that these are exactly the conditions under which we cannot swap the order of $A_1$ and $A_2$. Thus, $A_1$ will appear before $A_2$ in any schedule that is conflict-equivalent to $S$. As a result, if one of these schedules is a serial schedule, then it must have $T_1$ before $T_2$.

We can summarize these precedences in a precedence graph. The nodes of the precedence graph are the transactions of a schedule $S$. When the transactions are $T_i$ for various $i$, we shall label the node for $T_i$ by only the integer $i$. There is an arc from node $i$ to node $j$ if $T_i <_S T_j$.

**Example 9.7**: The following schedule $S$ involves three transactions, $T_1$, $T_2$, and $T_3$.

\[ S: r_2(A); r_1(B); w_2(A); r_3(A); w_1(B); w_3(A); r_2(B); w_2(B); \]

If we look at the actions involving $A$, we find several reasons why $T_2 <_S T_3$. For example, $r_2(A)$ comes ahead of $w_2(A)$ in $S$, and $w_3(A)$ comes ahead of both $r_3(A)$ and $w_3(A)$. Any one of these three observations is sufficient to justify the arc in the precedence graph of Fig. 9.9 from 2 to 3.

Similarly, if we look at the actions involving $B$, we find that there are several reasons why $T_1 <_S T_2$. For instance, the action $r_1(B)$ comes before $w_2(B)$. 

Why Conflict-Serializability is not Necessary for Serializability

One example has already been seen in Fig. 9.7. We saw there how the particular computation performed by \( T_2 \) made the schedule serializable. However, the schedule of Fig. 9.7 is not conflict-serializable, because \( A \) is written first by \( T_1 \) and \( B \) is written first by \( T_2 \). Since neither the writes of \( A \) nor the writes of \( B \) can be reordered, there is no way we can get all the actions of \( T_1 \) ahead of all actions of \( T_2 \), or vice-versa.

However, there are examples of serializable but not conflict-serializable schedules that do not depend on the computations performed by the transactions. For instance, consider three transactions \( T_1, T_2, \) and \( T_3 \) that each write a value for \( X \). \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) also write values for \( Y \) before they write values for \( X \). One possible schedule, which happens to be serial, is

\[
S_1: w_1(Y); w_2(X); w_2(Y); w_2(X); w_3(X)
\]

\( S_1 \) leaves \( X \) with the value written by \( T_3 \) and \( Y \) with the value written by \( T_2 \). However, so does the schedule

\[
S_2: w_1(Y); w_2(Y); w_2(X); w_1(X); w_3(X)
\]

Intuitively, the values of \( X \) written by \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) have no effect, since \( T_3 \) overwrites their values. Thus \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \) leave both \( X \) and \( Y \) with the same value. Since \( S_1 \) is serial, and \( S_2 \) has the same effect as \( S_1 \) on any database state, we know that \( S_2 \) is serializable. However, since we cannot swap \( w_1(Y) \) with \( w_2(Y) \), and we cannot swap \( w_1(X) \) with \( w_2(X) \), therefore we cannot convert \( S_2 \) to any serial schedule by swaps. That is, \( S_2 \) is serializable, but not conflict-serializable.

Thus, the precedence graph for \( S \) also has an arc from 1 to 2. However, these are the only arcs we can justify from the order of actions in schedule \( S \).

There is a simple rule for telling whether a schedule \( S \) is conflict-serializable:

- Construct the precedence graph for \( S \) and ask if there are any cycles.

If so, then \( S \) is not conflict-serializable. But if the graph is acyclic, then \( S \) is conflict-serializable, and moreover, any topological order of the nodes\(^2\) is a conflict-equivalent serial order.

\(^2\)A topological order of an acyclic graph is any order of the nodes such that for every arc \( a \rightarrow b \), node \( a \) precedes node \( b \) in the topological order. We can find a topological order for any acyclic graph by repeatedly removing nodes that have no predecessors among the remaining nodes.
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Figure 9.9: The precedence graph for the schedule 5 of Example 9.7

Example 9.8: Figure 9.9 is acyclic, so the schedule 5 of Example 9.7 is conflict-serializable. There is only one order of the nodes or transactions consistent with the arcs of that graph: \((T_1, T_2, T_3)\). Notice that it is indeed possible to convert 5 into the schedule in which all actions of each of the three transactions occur in this order; this serial schedule is:

\[ S': r_1(B); w_1(B); r_2(A); w_2(A); r_2(B); w_2(B); r_3(A); w_3(A); \]

To see that we can get from \( S \) to \( S' \) by swaps of adjacent elements, first notice we can move \( r_1(B) \) ahead of \( r_2(A) \) without conflict. Then, by three swaps we can move \( w_1(B) \) just after \( r_1(B) \), because each of the intervening actions involves A and not B. We can then move \( r_2(B) \) and \( w_2(B) \) to a position just after \( w_2(A) \), moving through only actions involving A; the result is \( S' \). □

Example 9.9: Consider the schedule

\[ S_1: r_2(A); r_1( ); w_2(A); r_2(B); r_3(A); w_1(B); w_3(A); w_2(B); \]

which differs from \( S \) only in that action \( r_2(B) \) has been moved forward three positions. Examination of the actions involving A still give us only the precedence \( T_2 < S_1 T_3 \). However, when we examine B we get not only \( T_1 < S_1 T_2 \) [because \( r_1(B) \) and \( w_1(B) \) appear before \( w_2(B) \)], but also \( T_2 < S_1 T_1 \) [because \( r_2(B) \) appears before \( w_2(B) \)]. Thus, we have the precedence graph of Fig. 9.10 for schedule \( S_1 \).

Figure 9.10: A cyclic precedence graph; its schedule is not conflict-serializable

This graph evidently has a cycle. We conclude that \( S_1 \) is not conflict-serializable. Intuitively, any conflict-equivalent serial schedule would have to have \( T_1 \) both ahead of and behind \( T_2 \), so therefore no such schedule exists. □

9.2.3 Why the Precedence-Graph Test Works

As we have seen, a cycle in the precedence graph puts too many constraints on the order of transactions in a hypothetical conflict-equivalent serial schedule. That is, if there is a cycle involving \( n \) transactions \( T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow T_n \rightarrow T_1 \), then in the hypothetical serial order, the actions of \( T_1 \) must precede those of
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$T_2$, which precede those of $T_3$, and so on, up to $T_n$. But the actions of $T_n$, which therefore come after those of $T_1$, are also required to precede those of $T_1$ because of the arc $T_n \rightarrow T_1$. Thus, we conclude that if there is a cycle in the precedence graph, then the schedule is not conflict-serializable.

The converse is a bit harder. We must show that whenever the precedence graph has no cycles, then we can reorder the schedule’s actions using legal swaps of adjacent actions, until the schedule becomes a serial schedule. If we can do so, then we have our proof that every schedule with an acyclic precedence graph is conflict-serializable. The proof is an induction on the number of transactions involved in the schedule.

**Basis:** If $n = 1$, i.e., there is only one transaction in the schedule, then the schedule is already serial, and therefore surely conflict-serializable.

**Induction:** Let the schedule $S$ consist of the actions of $n$ transactions $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n$.

We suppose that $S$ has an acyclic precedence graph. If a finite graph is acyclic, then there is at least one node that has no arcs in; let the node $T_i$ corresponding to transaction $T_i$ be such a node. Since there are no arcs into node $T_i$, there can be no action $A$ in $S$ that:

1. Involves any transaction $T_j$ other than $T_i$,
2. Precedes some action of $T_i$, and
3. Conflicts with that action.

For if there were, we should have put an arc from node $j$ to node $i$ in the precedence graph.

It is thus possible to swap all the actions of $T_i$, keeping them in order, but moving them to the front of $S$. The schedule has now taken the form

$$(\text{Actions of } T_i)(\text{Actions of the other } n - 1 \text{ transactions})$$

Let us now consider the tail of $S$ — the actions of all transactions other than $T_i$. Since these actions maintain the same relative order that they did in $S$, the precedence graph for the tail is the same as the precedence graph for $S$, except that the node for $T_i$ and any arcs out of that node are missing.

Since the original precedence graph was acyclic, and deleting nodes and arcs cannot make it cyclic, we conclude that the tail’s precedence graph is acyclic. Moreover, since the tail involves $n - 1$ transactions, the inductive hypothesis applies to it. Thus, we know we can reorder the actions of the tail using legal swaps of adjacent actions to turn it into a serial schedule. Now, $S$ itself has been turned into a serial schedule, with the actions of $T_i$ first and the actions of the other transactions following in some serial order. The induction is complete, and we conclude that every schedule with an acyclic precedence graph is conflict-serializable.
9.2.4 Exercises for Section 9.2

Exercise 9.2.1: Below are two transactions, described in terms of their effect on two database elements A and B, which we may assume are integers.

\( T_1: \text{READ}(A,t); t:=t+2; \text{WRITE}(A,t); \text{READ}(B,t); t:=t\times3; \text{WRITE}(B,t); \)

\( T_2: \text{READ}(B,s); s:=s\times2; \text{WRITE}(B,s); \text{READ}(A,s); s:=s+3; \text{WRITE}(A,s); \)

We assume that, whatever consistency constraints there are on the database, these transactions preserve them in isolation. Note that \( A = B \) is not the consistency constraint.

a) It turns out that both serial orders have the same effect on the database; that is, \((T_1, T_2)\) and \((T_2, T_1)\) are equivalent. Demonstrate this fact by showing the effect of the two transactions on an arbitrary initial database state.

b) Give examples of a serializable schedule and a nonserializable schedule of the 12 actions above.

c) How many serial schedules of the 12 actions are there?

\*!! d) How many serializable schedules of the 12 actions are there?

Exercise 9.2.2: The two transactions of Exercise 9.2.1 can be written in our notation that shows read- and write-actions only, as:

\( T_1: r_1(A); w_1(A); r_1(B); w_1(B); \)

\( T_2: r_2(B); w_2(B); r_2(A); w_2(A); \)

Answer the following:

\*! a) Among the possible schedules of the eight actions above, how many are conflict-equivalent to the serial order \((T_1, T_2)\)?

b) How many schedules of the eight actions are equivalent to the serial order \((T_2, T_1)\)?

!! c) How many schedules of the eight actions are equivalent (not necessarily conflict-equivalent) to the serial schedule \((T_1, T_2)\), assuming the transactions have the effect on the database described in Exercise 9.2.1?

! d) Why are the answers to (c) above and Exercise 9.2.1(d) different?

Exercise 9.2.3: Suppose the transactions of Exercise 9.2.2 are changed to be:

\( T_1: r_1(A); w_1(A); r_1(B); w_1(B); \)

\( T_2: r_2(A); w_2(A); r_2(B); w_2(B); \)
That is, the transactions retain their semantics from Exercise 9.2.1, but \( T_2 \) has been changed so A is processed before B. Give:

a) The number of conflict-serializable schedules.

b) The number of serializable schedules, assuming the transactions have the same effect on the database state as in Exercise 9.2.1.

**Exercise 9.2.4:** For each of the following schedules:

* a) \( r_1(A); r_2(A); r_3(B); w_1(A); r_2(B); w_2(B); w_3(C); \)

b) \( r_1(A); w_1(B); r_2(B); w_2(B); r_3(C); w_3(A); \)

c) \( w_3(A); r_1(A); w_1(B); r_2(B); w_2(C); r_3(C); \)

d) \( r_1(A); r_2(A); w_1(B); w_2(B); r_1(B); r_2(B); w_2(C); w_1(D); \)

e) \( r_1(A); r_2(A); r_1(B); r_2(B); r_3(A); r_4(B); w_1(A); w_2(B); \)

Answer the following questions:

i. What is the precedence graph for the schedule?

ii. Is the schedule conflict-serializable? If so, what are all the equivalent serial schedules?

iii. Are there any serial schedules that must be equivalent (regardless of what the transactions do to the data), but are not conflict-equivalent?

**Exercise 9.2.5:** Say that a transaction \( T \) precedes a transaction \( U \) in a schedule \( S \) if every action of \( T \) precedes every action of \( U \) in \( S \). Note that if \( T \) and \( U \) are the only transactions in \( S \), then saying \( T \) precedes \( U \) is the same as saying that \( S \) is the serial schedule \((T, U)\). However, if \( S \) involves transactions other than \( T \) and \( U \), then \( S \) might not be serializable, and in fact, because of the effect of other transactions, might not even be conflict-serializable. Give an example of a schedule \( S \) such that:

i. In \( S \), \( T_1 \) precedes \( T_2 \), and

ii. \( S \) is conflict-serializable, but

iii. In every serial schedule conflict-equivalent to \( S \), \( T_2 \) precedes \( T_1 \).

**Exercise 9.2.6:** Explain how, for any \( n > 1 \), one can find a schedule whose precedence graph has a cycle of length \( n \), but no smaller cycle.
Imagine a collection of transactions performing their actions in an unconstrained manner. These actions will form some schedule, but it is unlikely that the schedule will be serializable. It is the job of the scheduler to prevent orders of actions that lead to an unserializable schedule. In this section we consider the most common architecture for a scheduler, one in which "locks" are maintained on database elements to prevent unserializable behavior. Intuitively, a transaction obtains locks on the database elements it accesses to prevent other transactions from accessing these elements at roughly the same time and thereby incurring the risk of unserializability.

In this section, we introduce the concept of locking with an (overly) simple locking scheme. In this scheme, there is only one kind of lock, which transactions must obtain on a database element if they want to perform any operation whatsoever on that element. In Section 9.4, we shall learn more realistic locking schemes, with several kinds of lock, including the common shared/exclusive locks that correspond to the privileges of reading and writing, respectively.

9.3.1 Locks

In Fig. 9.11 we see a scheduler that uses a lock table to help perform its job. Recall that the responsibility of the scheduler is to take requests from transactions and either allow them to operate on the database or defer them until such time as it is safe to allow them to execute. A lock table will be used to guide this decision in a manner that we shall discuss at length.

Ideally, a scheduler would forward a request if and only if its execution cannot possibly lead to an inconsistent database state after all active transactions commit or abort. It is much too hard to decide this question in real time, however. Thus, all schedulers use a simple test that guarantees serializability but may forbid some actions that could not by themselves lead to inconsistency. A locking scheduler, like most types of scheduler, instead enforces conflict-serializability, which as we learned is a more stringent condition.
than serializability.

When a scheduler uses locks, transactions must request and release locks, in addition to reading and writing database elements. The use of locks must be proper in two senses, one applying to the structure of transactions, and the other to the structure of schedules.

- **Consistency of Transactions:** Actions and locks must relate in the expected ways:
  1. A transaction can only read or write an element if it previously requested a lock on that element and hasn't yet released the lock.
  2. If a transaction locks an element, it must later unlock that element.

- **Legality of Schedules:** Locks must have their intended meaning: no two transactions may have locked the same element without one having first released the lock.

We shall extend our notation for actions to include locking and unlocking actions:

\[ l_i(X) : \text{Transaction } T_i \text{ requests a lock on database element } X. \]

\[ u_i(X) : \text{Transaction } T_i \text{ releases its lock ("unlocks") database element } X. \]

Thus, the consistency condition for transactions can be stated as: "Whenever a transaction \( T_i \) has an action \( r_i(X) \) or \( w_i(X) \), then there is a previous action \( l_i(X) \) with no intervening action \( u_i(X) \), and there is a subsequent \( u_i(X) \)." The legality of schedules is stated: "If there are actions \( l_i(X) \) followed by \( l_j(X) \) in a schedule, then somewhere between these actions there must be an action \( u_i(X) \)."

**Example 9.10:** Let us consider the two transactions \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) that we introduced in Example 9.1. Recall that \( T_1 \) adds 100 to database elements \( A \) and \( B \), while \( T_2 \) doubles them. Here are specifications for these transactions, in which we have included lock actions as well as arithmetic actions to help us remember what the transactions are doing.

\[ T_1: l_1(A); r_1(A); A := A+100; w_1(A); u_1(A); l_1(B); r_1(B); B := B+100; w_1(B); u_1(B); \]

\[ T_2: l_2(A); r_2(A); A := A*2; w_2(A); u_2(A); l_2(B); r_2(B); B := B*2; w_2(B); u_2(B); \]

Each of these transactions is consistent. They each release the locks on \( A \) and \( B \) that they take. Moreover, they each operate on \( A \) and \( B \) only in steps where they have previously requested a lock on that element and have not yet released the lock.

\(^3\text{Remember that the actual computations of the transaction usually are not represented in our current notation, since they are not considered by the scheduler when deciding whether to grant or deny transaction requests.}\)
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Figure 9.12: A legal schedule of consistent transactions; unfortunately it is not serializable.

Figure 9.12 shows one legal schedule of these two transactions. To save space we have put several actions on one line. The schedule is legal because the two transactions never hold a lock on $A$ at the same time, and likewise for $B$. Specifically, $T_2$ does not execute $l_2(A)$ until after $T_1$ executes $u_1(A)$, and $T_1$ does not execute $l_1(B)$ until after $T_2$ executes $u_2(B)$. As we see from the trace of the values computed, the schedule, although legal, is not serializable. We shall see in Section 9.3.3 the additional condition, "two-phase locking," that we need to assure that legal schedules are conflict-serializable.

9.3.2 The Locking Scheduler

It is the job of a scheduler based on locking to grant requests if and only if the request will result in a legal schedule. To aid this decision, it has a lock table, which tells, for every database element, the transaction, if any, that currently holds a lock on that element. We shall discuss the structure of a lock table in more detail in Section 9.5.2. However, when there is only one kind of lock, as we have assumed so far, the table may be thought of as a relation $\text{Locks}(\text{element, transaction})$, consisting of pairs $(X, T)$ such that transaction $T$ currently has a lock on database element $X$. The scheduler has only to query this relation and modify it with simple INSERT and DELETE statements.

Example 9.11: The schedule of Fig. 9.12 is legal, as we mentioned, so the locking scheduler would grant every request in the order of arrival shown. However, sometimes it is not possible to grant requests. Here are $T_1$ and $T_2$ from:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
T_1 & T_2 & A & B \\
\hline
l_1(A); r_1(A); & 25 & 25 \\
A := A+100; & l_2(A); r_2(A); & 125 \\
w_1(A); u_1(A); & A := A*2; & w_2(A); u_2(A); \\
l_2(B); r_2(B); & 250 \\
B := B*2; & w_2(B); u_2(B); \\
\hline
l_1(B); r_1(B); & 50 \\
w_1(B); u_1(B); & 150 \\
\end{array}
$$
Example 9.10, with simple (but important, as we shall see in Section 9.3.3) changes, in which $T_1$ and $T_2$ each lock $B$ before releasing the lock on $A$.

$T_1$: $l_1(A)$; $r_1(A)$; $A := A+100$; $w_1(A)$; $l_1(B)$; $u_1(A)$; $r_1(B)$; $B := B+100$; $w_1(B)$; $u_1(B)$;

$T_2$: $l_2(A)$; $r_2(A)$; $A := A*2$; $w_2(A)$; $l_2(B)$; $u_2(A)$; $r_2(B)$; $B := B*2$; $w_2(B)$; $u_2(B)$;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th>$A$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$l_1(A)$; $r_1(A)$; $A := A+100$; $w_1(A)$; $l_1(B)$; $u_1(A)$; $l_2(A)$; $r_2(A)$; $A := A*2$; $w_2(A)$; $l_2(B)$</td>
<td>$25$</td>
<td>$25$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_1(B)$; $B := B+100$; $w_1(B)$; $u_1(B)$; $l_2(B)$; $u_2(A)$; $r_2(B)$; $B := B*2$; $w_2(B)$; $u_2(B)$</td>
<td>$125$</td>
<td>$250$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.13: The locking scheduler delays requests that would result in an illegal schedule.

In Fig. 9.13, when $T_2$ requests a lock on $B$, the scheduler must deny the lock, because $T_1$ still holds a lock on $B$. Thus, $T_2$ stalls, and the next actions are from $T_1$. Eventually, $T_1$ executes $u_1(B)$, which unlocks $B$. Now, $T_2$ can get its lock on $B$, which is executed at the next step. Notice that because $T_2$ was forced to wait, it wound up multiplying $B$ by 2 after $T_1$ added 100, resulting in a consistent database state.

9.3.3 Two-Phase Locking

There is a surprising condition under which we can guarantee that a legal schedule of consistent transactions is conflict-serializable. This condition, which is widely followed in commercial locking systems, is called two-phase locking (2PL). The 2PL condition is:

- In every transaction, all lock requests precede all unlock requests.

The "two phases" referred to by 2PL are thus the first phase, where locks are obtained and the second phase, where locks are relinquished. Two-phase
locking is a condition, like consistency, on the order of actions in a transaction. A transaction that obeys the 2PL condition is said to be a two-phase-locked transaction, or 2PL transaction.

**Example 9.12:** In Example 9.10, the transactions do not obey the two-phase locking rule. For instance, \( T_1 \) unlocks \( A \) before it locks \( B \). However, the versions of the transactions found in Example 9.11 do obey the 2PL condition. Notice that \( T_1 \) locks both \( A \) and \( B \) within the first five actions and unlocks them within the next five actions; \( T_2 \) behaves similarly. If we compare Figs. 9.12 and 9.13, we see how the two-phase-locked transactions interact properly with the scheduler to assure consistency, while the non-2PL transactions allow inconsistent (and therefore not-conflict-serializable) behavior.

### 9.3.4 Why Two-Phase Locking Works

It is true, but far from obvious, that the benefit from 2PL that we observed in our examples holds in general. Intuitively, each two-phase-locked transaction may be thought to execute in its entirety at the instant it issues its first unlock request, as suggested by Fig. 9.14. The conflict-equivalent serial schedule for a schedule \( S \) of 2PL transactions is the one in which the transactions are ordered in the same order as their first unlocks.\(^4\)

![Figure 9.14: Every two-phase-locked transaction has a point at which it may be thought to execute instantaneously](image)

We shall show how to convert any legal schedule \( S \) of consistent, two-phase-locked transactions to a conflict-equivalent serial schedule. The conversion is best described as an induction on \( n \), the number of transactions in \( S \). In what follows, it is important to remember that the issue of conflict-equivalence refers to the read and write actions only. As we swap the order of reads and writes, we ignore the lock and unlock actions. Once we have the read and write actions ordered serially, we can place the lock and unlock actions around them as the various transactions require. Since each transaction releases all locks before its end, we know that the serial schedule is legal.

\( ^4 \) In some schedules, there are other conflict-equivalent serial schedules as well.
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BASIS: If \( n = 1 \), there is nothing to do; \( S \) is already a serial schedule.

**INDUCTION:** Suppose \( S \) involves \( n \) transactions \( T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n \), and let \( T_i \) be the transaction with the first unlock action in the entire schedule \( S \), say \( u_i(X) \). We claim it is possible to move all the read and write actions of \( T_j \) forward to the beginning of the schedule without passing any conflicting actions.

Consider some action of \( T_j \), say \( w_j(Y) \). Could it be preceded in \( S \) by some conflicting action, say \( w_j(Y) \)? If so, then in schedule \( S \), actions \( u_j(Y) \) and \( l_i(Y) \) must intervene, in a sequence of actions

\[
\cdots w_j(Y); \cdots; u_i(Y); \cdots; l_i(Y); \cdots; w_i(Y); \cdots
\]

Since \( T_i \) is the first to unlock, \( u_i(X) \) precedes \( u_j(Y) \) in \( S \); that is, \( S \) might look like

\[
\cdots; w_j(Y); \cdots; u_i(X); \cdots; u_j(Y); \cdots; l_i(Y); \cdots; w_i(Y); \cdots
\]

or \( u_i(X) \) could even appear before \( w_j(Y) \). In any case, \( u_i(X) \) appears before \( l_i(Y) \), which means that \( T_j \) is not two-phase-locked, as we assumed. While we have only argued the nonexistence of conflicting pairs of writes, the same argument applies to any pair of potentially conflicting actions, one from \( T_i \) and the other from another \( T_j \).

We conclude that it is indeed possible to move all the actions of \( T_i \) forward to the beginning of \( S \), using swaps of nonconflicting read and write actions, followed by restoration of the lock and unlock actions of \( T_j \). That is, \( S \) can be written in the form

\[
(\text{Actions of } T_i)(\text{Actions of the other } n - 1 \text{ transactions})
\]

The tail of \( n - 1 \) transactions is still a legal schedule of consistent, 2PL transactions, so the inductive hypothesis applies to it. We convert the tail to a conflict-equivalent serial schedule, and now all of \( S \) has been shown conflict-serializable.

### 9.3.5 Exercises for Section 9.3

**Exercise 9.3.1:** Below are two transactions, with lock requests and the semantics of the transactions indicated. Recall from Exercise 9.2.1 that these transactions have the unusual property that they can be scheduled in ways that are not conflict-serializable, but, because of the semantics, are serializable.

\( T_1: l_1(A); r_1(A); A := A + 2; w_1(A); u_1(A); l_1(B); r_1(B); B := B * 3; w_1(B); u_1(B); \)

\( T_2: l_2(B); r_2(B); B := B * 2; w_2(B); u_2(B); l_2(A); r_2(A); A := A + 3; w_2(A); u_2(A); \)

In the questions below, consider only schedules of the read and write actions, not the lock, unlock, or assignment steps.
A Risk of Deadlock

One problem that is not solved by two-phase locking is the potential for deadlocks, where several transactions are forced by the scheduler to wait for a lock held by another transaction. For instance, consider the 2PL transactions from Example 9.11, but with \( T_2 \) changed to work on \( B \) first:

\[
T_1: l_1(A); r_1(A); A := A + 100; w_1(A); l_1(B); u_1(A); r_1(B); B := B + 100; w_1(B); u_1(B);
\]

\[
T_2: l_2(B); r_2(B); B := B \times 2; w_2(B); l_2(A); u_2(B); w_2(A); u_2(A);
\]

A possible interleaving of the actions of these transactions is:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
T_1 & T_2 & A & B \\
\hline
l_1(A); & l_2(B); & 25 & 25 \\
r_1(A); & r_2(B); & \text{Denied} & \text{Denied} \\
A := A + 100; & B := B \times 2; & 125 & 50 \\
w_1(A); & w_2(B); & & \\
l_1(B); & l_2(A); & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Now, neither transaction can proceed, and they wait forever. In Section 10.3, we shall discuss methods to remedy this situation. However, observe that it is not possible to allow both transactions to proceed, since if we do so the final database state cannot possibly have \( A = B \).

* a) Give an example of a schedule that is prohibited by the locks.

! b) Of the \( \binom{8}{4} = 70 \) orders of the eight read and write actions, how many are legal schedules (i.e., they are permitted by the locks)?

! c) Of the legal schedules, how many are serializable (according to the semantics of the transactions given)?

! d) Of those schedules that are legal and serializable, how many are conflict-serializable?

!! e) Since \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) are not two-phase-locked, we would expect that some nonserializable behaviors would occur. Are there any legal schedules that are unserializable? If so, give an example, and if not, explain why.
Exercise 9.3.2: Here are the transactions of Exercise 9.3.1, with all unlocks moved to the end so they are two-phase-locked.

\[ T_1: l_1(A); r_1(A); A := A + 2; w_1(A); r_1(B); B := B \times 3; w_1(B); u_1(A); u_1(B) \]

\[ T_2: l_2(B); r_2(B); B := B \times 2; w_2(B); r_2(A); A := A + 3; w_2(A); u_2(B); u_2(A) \]

How many legal schedules of all the read and write actions of these transactions are there?

Exercise 9.3.3: For each of the schedules of Exercise 9.2.4, assume that each transaction takes a lock on each database element immediately before it reads or writes the element, and that each transaction releases its locks immediately after the last time it accesses an element. Tell what the locking scheduler would do with each of these schedules; i.e., what requests would get delayed, and when would they be allowed to resume?

Exercise 9.3.4: For each of the transactions described below, suppose that we insert one lock and one unlock action for each database element that is accessed.

\* a) \( r_1(A); w_1(A); w_2(B); \)

\* b) \( r_2(A); w_2(A); w_2(B); \)

Tell how many orders of the lock, unlock, read, and write actions are:

i. Consistent and two-phase locked.

ii. Consistent, but not two-phase locked.

Hi. Inconsistent, but two-phase locked.

\* iv. Neither consistent nor two-phase locked.

9.4 Locking Systems With Several Lock Modes

The locking scheme of Section 9.3 illustrates the important ideas behind locking, but it is too simple to be a practical scheme. The main problem is that a transaction \( T \) must take a lock on a database element \( X \) even if it only wants to read \( X \) and not write it. We cannot avoid taking the lock, because if we didn't, then another transaction might write a new value for \( X \) while \( T \) was active and cause unserializable behavior. On the other hand, there is no reason why several transactions could not read \( X \) at the same time, as long as none is allowed to write \( X \).

We are thus motivated to introduce the first, and most common, locking scheme, where there are two different kinds of locks, one for reading (called a
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"shared lock" or "read lock"), and one for writing (called an "exclusive lock" or "write lock"). We then examine an improved scheme where transactions are allowed to take a shared lock and "upgrade" it to an exclusive lock later. We also consider "increment locks," which treat specially write actions that increment a database element; the important distinction is that increment operations commute, while general writes do not. These examples lead us to the general notion of a lock scheme described by a "compatibility matrix" that indicates what locks on a database element may be granted when other locks are held.

9.4.1 Shared and Exclusive Locks

Since two read actions on the same database element do not create a conflict, there is no need to use locking or any other concurrency-control mechanism to force the read actions to occur in one particular order. As suggested in the introduction, we still need to lock an element we are about to read, since a writer of that element must be inhibited. However, the lock we need for writing is "stronger" than the lock we need to read, since it must prevent both reads and writes.

Let us therefore consider a locking scheduler that uses two different kinds of locks: shared locks and exclusive locks. Intuitively, for any database element there can be either one exclusive lock on X, or no exclusive locks but any number of shared locks. If we want to write X, we need to have an exclusive lock on X, but if we wish only to read X we may have either a shared or exclusive lock on X. Presumably, if we want to read X but not write it, then we prefer to take only a shared lock.

We shall use slt(X) to mean "transaction T requests a shared lock on database element X" and xlt(X) for "T requests an exclusive lock on X." We continue to use ut(X) to mean that T unlocks X; i.e., it relinquishes whatever lock(s) it has on X.

The three kinds of requirements — consistency and 2PL for transactions, and legality for schedules — each have their counterpart for a shared/exclusive lock system. We summarize these requirements here:

1. Consistency of transactions: You may not write without holding an exclusive lock, and you may not read without holding some lock. More precisely, in any transaction Ti,

   (a) A read action r(x) must be preceded by slt(X) or xlt(X), with no intervening ut(X).

   (b) A write action w(x) must be preceded by xlt(X), with no intervening ut(X).

   All locks must be followed by an unlock of the same element.

2. Two-phase locking of transactions: Locking must precede unlocking. To be more precise, in any two-phase locked transaction Ti, no action slt(X) or xlt(X) can be preceded by an action ut(X).
3. **Legality of schedules:** An element may either be locked exclusively by one transaction or by several in shared mode, but not both. More precisely:

(a) If \( xl_i(X) \) appears in a schedule, then there cannot be a following \( xl_j(X) \) or \( sl_j(X) \), for some \( j \) other than \( i \), without an intervening \( u_i(X) \).

(b) If \( sl_i(X) \) appears in a schedule, then there cannot be a following \( xl_j(X) \), for \( j \neq i \), without an intervening \( u_i(X) \).

Note that we do allow one transaction request and hold both shared and exclusive locks on the same element, provided its doing so does not conflict with the lock(s) of other transactions. If transactions know in advance their needs for locks, then surely only the exclusive lock would be requested, but if lock needs are unpredictable, then it is possible that one transaction would request both shared and exclusive locks at different times.

**Example 9.13:** Let us examine a possible schedule of the following two transactions, using shared and exclusive locks:

\[
T_1: \text{sl}_1(A); \text{r}_1(A); \text{xl}_1(B); \text{r}_1(B); \text{w}_1(B); \text{u}_1(A); \text{u}_1(B);
\]

\[
T_2: \text{sl}_2(A); \text{r}_2(A); \text{sl}_2(B); \text{r}_2(B); \text{u}_2(A); \text{u}_2(B);
\]

Both \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) read \( A \) and \( B \), but only \( T_1 \) writes \( B \). Neither writes \( A \).

In Fig. 9.15 is an interleaving of the actions of \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) in which \( T_1 \) begins by getting a shared lock on \( A \). Then, \( T_2 \) follows by getting shared locks on both \( A \) and \( B \). Now, \( T_1 \) needs an exclusive lock on \( B \), since it will both read and write \( B \). However, it cannot get the exclusive lock because \( T_2 \) already has a shared lock on \( B \). Thus, the scheduler forces \( T_1 \) to wait. Eventually, \( T_2 \) releases the lock on \( B \). At that time, \( T_1 \) may complete. \( \Box \)

---

![Figure 9.15: A schedule using shared and exclusive locks](image-url)
we do not prove it here, the argument we gave in Section 9.3.4 to show that legal schedules of consistent, 2PL transactions are conflict-serializable applies to systems with shared and exclusive locks as well. In Fig. 9.15, \( T_2 \) unlocks before \( T_1 \), so we would expect \( T_2 \) to precede \( T_1 \) in the serial order. Equivalently, we may examine the read and write actions of Fig. 9.15 and notice that we can swap \( r_1(A) \) back, past all the actions of \( T_2 \), while we cannot move \( w_1(B) \) ahead of \( r_2(B) \), which would be necessary if \( T_1 \) could precede \( T_2 \) in a conflict-equivalent serial schedule.

### 9.4.2 Compatibility Matrices

If we use several lock modes, then the scheduler needs a policy about when it can grant a lock request, given the other locks that may already be held on the same database element. While the shared/exclusive system is simple, we shall see that there are considerably more complex systems of lock modes in use. We shall therefore introduce the following notation for describing lock-granting policies in the context of the simple shared/exclusive system.

A compatibility matrix has a row and column for each lock mode. The rows correspond to a lock that is already held on an element \( X \) by another transaction, and the columns correspond to the mode of a lock on \( X \) that is requested. The rule for using a compatibility matrix for lock-granting decisions is:

- We can grant the lock in mode \( C \) if and only if for every row \( R \) such that there is already a lock on \( X \) in mode \( R \) by some other transaction, there is a "Yes" in column \( C \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lock held in mode</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.16: The compatibility matrix for shared and exclusive locks

**Example 9.14:** Figure 9.16 is the compatibility matrix for shared (S) and exclusive (X) locks. The column for S says that we can grant a shared lock on an element if the only locks held on that element currently are shared locks. The column for X says that we can grant an exclusive lock only if there are no other locks held currently. Notice how these rules reflect the definition of legality of schedules for this system of locks. □
9.4.3 Upgrading Locks

A transaction $T$ that takes a shared lock on $X$ is being "friendly" toward other transactions, since they are allowed to read $X$ at the same time $T$ is. Thus, we might wonder whether it would be friendlier still if a transaction $T$ that wants to read and write a new value of $X$ were to first take a shared lock on $X$, and only later, when $T$ was ready to write the new value, upgrade the lock to exclusive (i.e., request an exclusive lock on $X$ in addition to its already held shared lock on $X$). There is nothing that prevents a transaction from issuing requests for locks on the same database element in different modes. We adopt the convention that $u_t(X)$ releases all locks on $X$ held by transaction $T_t$, although we could introduce mode-specific unlock actions if there were a use for them.

Example 9.15: In the following example, transaction $T_1$ is able to perform its computation concurrently with $T_2$, which would not be possible had $T_1$ taken an exclusive lock on $B$ initially. The two transactions are:

$T_1$: $sl_1(A); r_1(A); sl_1(B); r_1(B); xl_1(B); w_1(B); u_1(A); u_1(B);
T_2$: $sl_2(A); r_2(A); sl_2(B); r_2(B); u_2(A); u_2(B);

Here, $T_1$ reads $A$ and $B$ and performs some (possibly lengthy) calculation with them, eventually using the result to write a new value of $B$. Notice that $T_1$ takes a shared lock on $B$ first, and later, after its calculation involving $A$ and $B$ is finished, requests an exclusive lock on $B$. Transaction $T_2$ only reads $A$ and $B$, and does not write.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
T_1 & T_2 \\
\text{sl}_1(A); r_1(A); & \text{sl}_2(A); r_2(A); \\
\text{sl}_1(B); r_1(B); & \text{sl}_2(B); r_2(B); \\
\text{xl}_1(B) \text{ Denied} & \\
xl_1(B); w_1(B); & u_2(A); u_2(B) \\
u_1(A); u_2(B); & \\
\end{array}
$$

Figure 9.17: Upgrading locks allows more concurrent operation.

Figure 9.17 shows a possible schedule of actions. $T_1$ gets a shared lock on $B$ before $T_1$ does, but on the fourth line, $T_1$ is also able to lock $B$ in shared mode. Thus, $T_1$ has both $A$ and $B$ and can perform its computation using their values. It is not until $T_1$ tries to upgrade its lock on $B$ to exclusive that the scheduler must deny the request and force $T_1$ to wait until $T_2$ releases its lock on $B$. At that time, $T_1$ gets its exclusive lock on $B$, writes $B$, and finishes.
Notice that had $T_1$ asked for an exclusive lock on $B$ initially, before reading $B$, then the request would have been denied, because $T_2$ already had a shared lock on $B$. $T_1$ could not perform its computation without reading $B$, and so $T_1$ would have more to do after $T_2$ releases its locks. As a result, $T_1$ finishes later using only an exclusive lock on $B$ than it would if it used the upgrading strategy.

**Example 9.16:** Unfortunately, indiscriminate use of upgrading introduces a new and potentially serious source of deadlocks. Suppose that $T_1$ and $T_2$ each read database element $A$ and write a new value for $A$. If both transactions use an upgrading approach, first getting a shared lock on $A$ and then upgrading it to exclusive, the sequence of events suggested in Fig. 9.18 will happen whenever $T_1$ and $T_2$ initiate at approximately the same time.

![Figure 9.18: Upgrading by two transactions can cause a deadlock](image)

$T_1$ and $T_2$ are both able to get shared locks on $A$. Then, they each try to upgrade to exclusive, but the scheduler forces each to wait because the other has a shared lock on $A$. Thus, neither can make progress, and they will each wait forever, or until the system discovers that there is a deadlock, aborts one of the two transactions, and gives the other the exclusive lock on $A$.

**9.4.4 Update Locks**

There is a way to avoid the deadlock problem of Example 9.16 by using a third lock mode, called update locks. An update lock $ul_i(X)$ gives transaction $T_i$ only the privilege to read $X$, not to write $X$. However, only the update lock can be upgraded to a write lock later; a read lock cannot be upgraded. We can grant an update lock on $X$ when there are already shared locks on $X$, but once there is an update lock on $X$ we prevent additional locks of any kind — shared, update, or exclusive — from being taken on $X$. The reason is that if we don't deny such locks, then the updater might never get a chance to upgrade to exclusive, since there would always be other locks on $X$.

This rule leads to an asymmetric compatibility matrix, because the update (U) lock looks like a shared lock when we are requesting it and looks like an exclusive lock when we already have it. Thus, the columns for U and S locks are the same, and the rows for U and X locks are the same. The matrix is
shown in Fig. 9.19.\footnote{Remember, however, that there is an additional condition regarding legality of schedules that is not reflected by this matrix: a transaction holding a shared lock but not an update lock on an element $X$ cannot be given an exclusive lock on $X$, even though we do not prohibit a transaction from holding multiple locks on an element.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.19: Compatibility matrix for shared, exclusive, and update locks

**Example 9.17:** The use of update locks would have no effect on Example 9.15. As its third action, $T_1$ would take an update lock on $B$, rather than a shared lock. But the update lock would be granted, since only shared locks are held on $B$, and the same sequence of actions shown in Fig. 9.17 would occur.

However, update locks fix the problem shown in Example 9.16. Now, both $T_1$ and $T_2$ first request update locks on $A$ and only later take exclusive locks. Possible descriptions of $T_1$ and $T_2$ are:

$T_1$: $u_1(A); r_1(A); x_1(A); w_1(A); u_1(A)$;

$T_2$: $u_2(A); r_2(A); x_2(A); w_2(A); u_2(A)$;

The sequence of events corresponding to Fig. 9.18 is shown in Fig. 9.20. Now, $T_2$, the second to request an update lock on $A$, is denied. $T_1$ is allowed to finish, and then $T_2$ may proceed. The lock system has effectively prevented concurrent execution of $T_1$ and $T_2$, but in this example, any significant amount of concurrent execution will result in either a deadlock or an inconsistent database state. D

\[ T_1 \]
\[ u_1(A); r_1(A); x_1(A); w_1(A); u_1(A); \]
\[ T_2 \]
\[ u_2(A); r_2(A); x_2(A); w_2(A); u_2(A); \]

Figure 9.20: Correct execution using update locks
9.4.5 Increment Locks

Another interesting kind of lock that is useful in some situations is an "increment lock." Many transactions operate on the database only by incrementing or decrementing stored values. Examples are:

1. A transaction that transfers money from one bank account to another.
2. A transaction that sells an airplane ticket and decrements the count of available seats on that flight.

The interesting property of increment actions is that they commute with each other, since if two transactions add constants to the same database element, it does not matter which goes first, as the diagram of database state transitions in Fig. 9.21 suggests. On the other hand, incrementation commutes with neither reading nor writing; if you read A before or after it is incremented, you get different values, and if you increment A before or after some other transaction writes a new value for A, you get different values of A in the database.

Let us introduce as a possible action in transactions the increment action, written \( \text{INC}(A,c) \). Informally, this action adds constant \( c \) to database element \( A \), which we assume is a single number. Note that \( c \) could be negative, in which case we are really decrementing \( A \). In practice, we might apply INC to a component of a tuple, while the tuple itself, rather than one of its components, is the lockable element.

More formally, we use \( \text{INC}(A,c) \) to stand for the atomic execution of the following steps: \( \text{READ}(A,t); \ t := t+c; \ \text{WRITE}(A,t) \). We shall not discuss the hardware and/or software mechanism that would be used to make this operation atomic, but we should note that this form of atomicity is on a lower level than the atomicity of transactions that we support by locking.

Corresponding to the increment action, we need an increment lock. We shall denote the action of \( T \), requesting an increment lock on \( X \) by \( il_X(T) \). We also use shorthand \( inc_X(T) \) for the action in which transaction \( T \) increments database element \( X \) by some constant; the exact constant doesn't matter.

The existence of increment actions and locks requires us to make several modifications to our definitions of consistent transactions, conflicts, and legal schedules. These changes are:

![Diagram](image.png)
a) A consistent transaction can only have an increment action on $X$ if it holds an increment lock on $X$ at the time. An increment lock does not enable either read or write actions, however.

b) In a legal schedule, any number of transactions can hold an increment lock on $X$ at any time. However, if an increment lock on $X$ is held by some transaction, then no other transaction can hold either a shared or exclusive lock on $X$ at the same time. These requirements are expressed by the compatibility matrix of Fig. 9.22, where $/\$ represents a lock in increment mode.

c) The action $\text{inc}_i(X)$ conflicts with both $T_j(X)$ and $W_j(X)$, for $j \neq i$, but does not conflict with $\text{inc}_j(X)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.22: Compatibility matrix for shared, exclusive, and increment locks

**Example 9.18**: Consider two transactions, each of which read database element $A$ and then increment $B$. Perhaps they add $A$ to $B$, or the constant by which they increment $B$ may depend in some other way on $A$.

$T_1$: $s_1(A); r_1(A); d_1(B); \text{inc}_1(B); u_1(A); u_1(B)$

$T_2$: $s_2(A); r_2(A); d_2(B); \text{inc}_2(B); u_2(A); u_2(B)$

Notice that the transactions are consistent, since they only perform an incrementation while they have an increment lock, and they only read while they have a shared lock. Figure 9.23 shows a possible interleaving of $T_1$ and $T_2$. $T_1$ reads $A$ first, but then $T_2$ both reads $A$ and increments $B$. However, $T_1$ is then allowed to get its increment lock on $B$ and proceed.

Notice that the scheduler did not have to delay any requests in Fig. 9.23. Suppose, for instance, that $T_1$ increments $B$ by $A$, and $T_2$ increments $B$ by $2A$. They can execute in either order, since the value of $A$ does not change, and the incrementations may also be performed in either order.

Put another way, we may look at the sequence of non-lock actions in the schedule of Fig. 9.23; they are:

5: $r_1(A); r_2(A); \text{mc}_2(B); \text{mc}_1(B)$
## 9.4. Locking Systems with Several Lock Modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$sl_1(A); r_1(A)$;</td>
<td>$sl_2(A); r_2(A)$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$il_1(B); m_1(B)$;</td>
<td>$il_2(B); m_2(B)$;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u_1(A); u_1(B)$;</td>
<td>$u_2(A); u_2(B)$;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.23: A schedule of transactions with increment actions and locks

We may move the last action, $inc_1(B)$, to the second position, since it does not conflict with another increment of the same element, and surely does not conflict with a read of a different element. This sequence of swaps shows that $S$ is conflict-equivalent to the serial schedule $r_1(A); m_1(B); r_2(A); inc_2(B);$. Similarly, we can move the first action, $r_1(A)$ to the third position by swaps, giving a serial schedule in which $T_2$ precedes $T_1$. D

### 9.4.6 Exercises for Section 9.4

**Exercise 9.4.1**: For each of the schedules of transactions $T_1, T_2$, and $T_3$ below:

- **a)** $r_1(A); r_2(B); r_3(C); w_1(B); w_2(C); w_3(D);$ 
- **b)** $r_1(A); r_2(B); r_3(C); w_1(B); w_2(C); w_3(A);$ 
- **c)** $r_1(A); r_2(B); r_3(C); r_1(B); r_2(C); r_3(D); w_1(C); w_2(D); w_3(E);$ 
- **d)** $r_1(A); r_2(B); r_3(C); r_1(B); r_2(C); r_3(D); w_1(A); w_2(B); w_3(A);$ 
- **e)** $r_1(A); r_2(B); r_3(C); r_1(B); r_2(C); r_3(A); w_1(A); w_2(B); w_3(C);$ 

Do each of the following:

- **i.** Insert shared and exclusive locks, and insert unlock actions. Place a shared lock immediately in front of each read action that is not followed by a write action of the same element by the same transaction. Place an exclusive lock in front of every other read or write action. Place the necessary unlocks at the end of every transaction.
- **ii.** Tell what happens when each schedule is run by a scheduler that supports shared and exclusive locks.
- **iii.** Insert shared and exclusive locks in a way that allows upgrading. Place a shared lock in front of every read, an exclusive lock in front of every write, and place the necessary unlocks at the ends of the transactions.
iv. Tell what happens when each schedule from (iii) is run by a scheduler that supports shared locks, exclusive locks, and upgrading.

v. Insert shared, exclusive, and update locks, along with unlock actions. Place a shared lock in front of every read action that is not going to be upgraded, place an update lock in front of every read action that will be upgraded, and place an exclusive lock in front of every write action. Place unlocks at the ends of transactions, as usual.

vi. Tell what happens when each schedule from (v) is run by a scheduler that supports shared, exclusive, and update locks.

Exercise 9.4.2: Consider the two transactions:

\[ T_1: r_1(A); r_1(B); inc_1(A); inc_1(B); \]
\[ T_2: r_2(A); r_2(B); inc_2(A); inc_2(B); \]

Answer the following:

* a) How many interleavings of these transactions are serializable?

b) If the order of incrementation in \( T_2 \) were reversed [i.e., \( inc_2(B) \) followed by \( inc_2(A) \)], how many serializable interleavings would there be?

Exercise 9.4.3: For each of the following schedules, insert appropriate locks (read, write, or increment) before each action, and unlocks at the ends of transactions. Then tell what happens when the schedule is run by a scheduler that supports these three types of locks.

a) \( r_1(A); r_2(B); inc_1(B); inc_2(C); w_1(C); w_2(D); \)

b) \( r_1(A); r_2(B); inc_1(B); inc_2(A); w_1(C); w_2(D); \)

c) \( inc_1(A); inc_2(B); inc_1(B); inc_2(C); w_1(C); w_2(D); \)

Exercise 9.4.4: In Exercise 9.1.1, we discussed a hypothetical transaction involving an airline reservation. If the transaction manager had available to it shared, exclusive, update, and increment locks, what lock would you recommend for each of the steps of the transaction?

Exercise 9.4.5: The action of multiplication by a constant factor can be modeled by an action of its own. Suppose \( MC(X,c) \) stands for an atomic execution of the steps \( \text{READ}(X,t); t := c*t; \text{WRITE}(X,t); \). We can also introduce a lock mode that allows only multiplication by a constant factor.

\[ a) \text{Show the compatibility matrix for read, write, and multiplication-by-a-constant locks.} \]
9.4. LOCKING SYSTEMS WITH SEVERAL LOCK MODES

! b) Show the compatibility matrix for read, write, incrementation, and multiplication-by-a-constant locks.

! Exercise 9.4.6: Suppose for sake of argument that database elements are two-dimensional vectors. There are four operations we can perform on vectors, and each will have its own type of lock.

i. Change the value along the $x$-axis (a $X$-lock).

ii. Change the value along the $y$-axis (a $Y$-lock).

iii. Change the angle of the vector (an $A$-lock).

iv. Change the magnitude of the vector (an $M$-lock).

Answer the following questions.

* a) Which pairs of operations commute? For example, if we rotate the vector so its angle is $120^\circ$ and then change the $x$-coordinate to be 10, is that the same as first changing the $x$-coordinate to 10 and then changing the angle to $120^\circ$?

b) Based on your answer to (a), what is the compatibility matrix for the four types of locks?

!! c) Suppose we changed the four operations so that instead of giving new values for a measure, the operations incremented the measure (e.g., "add 10 to the $x$-coordinate," or "rotate the vector $30^\circ$ clockwise"). What would the compatibility matrix then be?

! Exercise 9.4.7: Here is a schedule with one action missing:

\[
r_1(A); r_2(B); ??; w_1(C); w_2(A);
\]

Your problem is to figure out what actions of certain types could replace the ??? and make the schedule not be serializable. Tell all possible nonserializable replacements for each of the following types of action:

* a) Read actions.

b) Write actions.

c) Update actions.

d) Increment actions.
9.5 An Architecture for a Locking Scheduler

Having seen a number of different locking schemes, we next need to consider how a scheduler that uses one of these schemes operates. We shall consider here only a simple scheduler architecture based on several principles:

1. The transactions themselves do not request locks, or cannot be relied upon to do so. It is the job of the scheduler to insert lock actions into the stream of reads, writes, and other actions that access data.

2. Transactions do not release locks. Rather, the scheduler releases the locks when the transaction manager tells it that the transaction will commit or abort.

![Diagram of a scheduler that inserts lock requests into the transactions' request stream](image)

9.5.1 A Scheduler That Inserts Lock Actions

Figure 9.24 shows a two-part scheduler that accepts requests such as read, write, commit, and abort, from transactions. The scheduler maintains a lock table, which, although it is shown as secondary-storage data, may be partially or completely in main memory. Normally, the main memory used by the lock table is not part of the buffer pool that we used for query execution and logging. Rather, the lock table is just another component of the DBMS, and will be allocated space by the operating system like other code and internal data of the DBMS.
Actions requested by a transaction are generally transmitted through the scheduler and executed on the database. However, under some circumstances a transaction is delayed, waiting for a lock, and its requests are not (yet) transmitted to the database. The two parts of the scheduler perform the following actions:

1. Part I takes the stream of requests generated by the transactions and inserts appropriate lock actions ahead of all database-access operations, such as read, write, increment, or update. The database access actions are then transmitted to Part II. Part I of the scheduler must select an appropriate lock mode from whatever set of lock modes the scheduler is using.

2. Part II takes the sequence of lock and database-access actions passed to it by Part I, and executes each appropriately. If a lock or database-access request is received by Part II, it determines whether the issuing transaction T is delayed because a lock has not been granted. If so, then the action is itself delayed and added to a list of actions that must eventually be performed for transaction T. If T is not delayed (i.e., all locks it previously requested have been granted already), then

   (a) If the action is a database access, it is transmitted to the database and executed.

   (b) If a lock action is received by Part II, it examines the lock table to see if the lock can be granted.
      
      i. If so, the lock table is modified to include the lock just granted.
      
      ii. If not, then an entry must be made in the lock table to indicate that the lock has been requested. Part II of the scheduler then delays further actions for transaction T, until such time as the lock is granted.

3. When a transaction T commits or aborts, Part I is notified by the transaction manager, and releases all locks held by T. If any transactions are waiting for any of these locks, Part I notifies Part II.

4. When Part II is notified that a lock on some database element X is available, it determines the next transaction or transactions that can now be given a lock on X. The transactions that receive a lock are allowed to execute as many of their delayed actions as can execute, until either they complete or reach another lock request that cannot be granted.

Example 9.19: If there is only one kind of lock, as in Section 9.3, then the task of Part I of the scheduler is simple. If it sees any action on database element X, and it has not already inserted a lock request on X for that transaction, then it inserts the request. When a transaction commits or aborts, Part I can forget about that transaction after releasing its locks, so the memory required for Part I does not grow indefinitely.
When there are several kinds of locks, the scheduler may require advance notice of what future actions on the same database element will occur. Let us reconsider the case of shared-exclusive-update locks, using the transactions of Example 9.15, which we now write without any locks at all:

\[ T_1: r_1(A); r_1(B); w_1(B); \]
\[ T_2: r_2(A); r_2(B); \]

The messages sent to Part I of the scheduler must include not only the read or write request, but an indication of future actions on the same element. In particular, when \( r_1(B) \) is sent, the scheduler needs to know that there will be a later \( w_1(B) \) action (or might be such an action, if transaction \( T_1 \) involves branching in its code). There are several ways the information might be made available. For example, if the transaction is a query, we know it will not write anything. If the transaction is an SQL database modification command, then the query processor can determine in advance the database elements that might be both read and written. If the transaction is a program with embedded SQL, then the compiler has access to all the SQL statements (which are the only ones that can write to the database) and can determine the potential database elements written.

In our example, suppose that events occur in the order suggested by Fig. 9.17. Then \( T_1 \) first issues \( r_1(A) \). Since there will be no future upgrading of this lock, the scheduler inserts \( s_1(A) \) ahead of \( r_1(A) \). Next, the requests from \( T_2 - r_2(A) \) and \( r_2(B) \) — arrive at the scheduler. Again there is no future upgrade, so the sequence of actions \( s_2(A); r_2(A); s_2(B); r_2(B) \) are issued by Part I.

Then, the action \( r_1(B) \) arrives at the scheduler, along with a warning that this lock may be upgraded. The scheduler Part I thus emits \( u_1(B); r_1(B) \) to Part II. The latter consults the lock table and finds that it can grant the update lock on \( B \) to \( T_1 \), because there are only shared locks on \( B \).

When the action \( w_1(B) \) arrives at the scheduler, Part I emits \( x_l(B); w_1(B) \). However, Part II cannot grant the \( x_l(B) \) request, because there is a shared lock on \( B \) for \( T_2 \). This and any subsequent actions from \( T_1 \) are delayed, stored by Part II for future execution. Eventually, \( T_2 \) commits, and Part I releases the locks on \( A \) and \( B \) that \( T_2 \) held. At that time, it is found that \( T_1 \) is waiting for a lock on \( B \). Part II of the scheduler is notified, and it finds the lock \( x_l(B) \) is now available. It enters this lock into the lock table and proceeds to execute stored actions from \( T_1 \) to the extent possible. In this case, \( T_1 \) completes. D

### 9.5.2 The Lock Table

Abstractly, the lock table is a relation that associates database elements with locking information about that element, as suggested by Fig. 9.25. The table might, for instance, be implemented with a hash table, using (addresses of) database elements as the hash key. Any element that is not locked does not
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Figure 9.25: A lock table is a mapping from database elements to their lock information. Appear in the table, so the size is proportional to the number of locked elements only, not to the size of the entire database.

Figure 9.26: Structure of lock-table entries

In Fig. 9.26 is an example of the sort of information we would find in a lock-table entry. This example structure assumes that the shared-exclusive-update lock scheme of Section 9.4.4 is used by the scheduler. The entry shown for a typical database element A is a tuple with the following components:

1. The group mode is a summary of the most stringent conditions that a transaction requesting a new lock on A faces. Rather than comparing the lock request with every lock held by another transaction on the same
element, we can simplify the grant/deny decision by comparing the request with only the group mode. For the shared-exclusive-update \((SXU)\) lock scheme, the rule is simple: a group mode of

(a) \(S\) means that only shared locks are held.
(b) \(U\) means that there is one update lock and perhaps one or more shared locks.
(c) \(X\) means there is one exclusive lock and no other locks.

For other lock schemes, there is usually an appropriate system of summaries by a group mode; we leave examples as exercises.

2. The waiting bit tells that there is at least one transaction waiting for a lock on \(A\).

3. A list describing all those transactions that either currently hold locks on \(A\) or are waiting for a lock on \(A\). Useful information that each list entry has might include:

(a) The name of the transaction holding or waiting for a lock.
(b) The mode of this lock.
(c) Whether the transaction is holding or waiting for the lock.

We also show in Fig. 9.26 two links for each entry. One links the entries themselves, and the other links all entries for a particular transaction (\(T_{\text{next}}\) in the figure). The latter link would be used when a transaction commits or aborts, so that we can easily find all the locks that must be released.

**Handling Lock Requests**

Suppose transaction \(T\) requests a lock on \(A\). If there is no lock-table entry for \(A\), then surely there are no locks on \(A\), so the entry is created and the request is granted. If the lock-table entry for \(A\) exists, we use it to guide the decision about the lock request. We find the group mode, which in Fig. 9.26 is \(U\), or "update." Once there is an update lock on an element, no other lock can be granted (except in the case that \(T\) itself holds the \(U\) lock and other locks are compatible with \(T\)'s request). Thus, this request by \(T\) is denied, and an entry will be placed on the list saying \(T\) requests a lock (in whatever mode was requested), and \(\text{Wait}\) = 'yes'.

\(^6\)The lock manager must, however, deal with the possibility that the requesting transaction already has a lock in another mode on the same element. For instance, in the \(SXU\) lock system discussed, the lock manager may be able to grant an \(X\)-lock request if the requesting transaction is the one that holds a \(U\) lock on the same element. For systems that do not support multiple locks held by one transaction on one element, the group mode always tells what the lock manager needs to know.
If the group mode had been \( \text{X} \) (exclusive), then the same thing would happen, but if the group mode were \( \text{S} \) (shared), then another shared or update lock could be granted. In that case, the entry for \( T \) on the list would have \( \text{Wait} = \text{no} \), and the group mode would be changed to \( \text{U} \) if the new lock were an update lock; otherwise, the group mode would remain \( \text{S} \). Whether or not the lock is granted, the new list entry is linked properly, through its \( T_{\text{next}} \) and \( \text{Next} \) fields. Notice that whether or not the lock is granted, the entry in the lock table tells the scheduler what it needs to know without having to examine the list of locks.

**Handling Unlocks**

Now suppose transaction \( T \) unlocks \( A \). \( T \)'s entry on the list for \( A \) is deleted. If the lock held by \( T \) is not the same as the group mode (e.g., \( T \) held an \( S \) lock, while the group mode was \( \text{U} \)), then there is no reason to change the group mode. On the other hand, if \( T \)'s lock is in the group mode, we may have to examine the entire list to find the new group mode. In the example of Fig. 9.26, we know there can be only one \( \text{U} \) lock on an element, so if that lock is released, the new group mode could be only \( \text{S} \) (if there are shared locks remaining) or nothing (if no other locks are currently held).\(^7\) If the group mode is \( \text{X} \), we know there are no other locks, and if the group mode is \( \text{S} \), we need to determine whether there are other shared locks.

If the value of \( \text{Waiting} \) is \( \text{yes} \), then we need to grant one or more locks from the list of requested locks. There are several different approaches, each with its advantages:

1. **First-come-first-served**: Grant the lock request that has been waiting the longest. This strategy guarantees no starvation, the situation where a transaction can wait forever for a lock.

2. **Priority to shared locks**: First grant all the shared locks waiting. Then, grant one update lock, if there are any waiting. Only grant an exclusive lock if no others are waiting. This strategy can allow starvation, if a transaction is waiting for a \( \text{U} \) or \( \text{X} \) lock.

3. **Priority to upgrading**: If there is a transaction with a \( \text{U} \) lock waiting to upgrade it to an \( \text{X} \) lock, grant that first. Otherwise, follow one of the other strategies mentioned.

### 9.5.3 Exercises for Section 9.5

**Exercise 9.5.1**: What are suitable group modes for a lock table if the lock modes used are:

a) Shared and exclusive locks.
!* b) Shared, exclusive, and increment locks.

!! c) The lock modes of Exercise 9.4.6.

Exercise 9.5.2: For each of the schedules of Exercise 9.2.4, tell the steps that
the locking scheduler described in this section would execute.

9.6 Managing Hierarchies of Database Elements

Let us now return to the exploration of different locking schemes that we began
in Section 9.4. In particular, we shall focus on two problems that come up when
there is a tree structure to our data.

1. The first kind of tree structure we encounter is a hierarchy of lockable
elements. We shall discuss in this section how to allow locks on both large
elements, e.g., relations, and smaller elements contained within these, such
as blocks holding several tuples of the relation, or individual tuples.

2. The second kind of hierarchy that is important in concurrency-control
systems is data that is itself organized in a tree. A major example is B-
tree indexes. We may view nodes of the B-tree as database elements, but
if we do, then as we shall see in Section 9.7, the locking schemes studied
so far perform poorly, and we need to use a new approach.

9.6.1 Locks With Multiple Granularity

Recall that the term "database element" was purposely left undefined, because
different systems use different sizes of database elements to lock, such as tuples,
pages or blocks, and relations. Some applications profit from small database
elements, such as tuples, while others are best off with large elements.

Example 9.20: Consider a database for a bank. If we treated relations as
database elements, and therefore had only one lock for an entire relation such
as the one giving account balances, then the system would allow very little
concurrency. Since most transactions will change the account balance either
positively or negatively, most transactions would need an exclusive lock on the
accounts relation. Thus, only one deposit or withdrawal could take place at
any time, no matter how many processors we had available to execute these
transactions. A better approach is to lock individual pages or data blocks.
Thus, two accounts whose tuples are on different blocks can be updated at the
same time, offering almost all the concurrency that is possible in the system.
The extreme would be to provide a lock for every tuple, so any set of accounts
whatsoever could be updated at once, but this fine a grain of locks is probably
not worth the extra effort.

In contrast, consider a database of documents. These documents may be
edited from time to time, but most transactions will retrieve whole documents.
The sensible choice of database element is a complete document. Since most transactions are read-only (i.e., they do not perform any write actions), locking is only necessary to avoid the reading of a document that is in the middle of being edited. Were we to use smaller-granularity locks, such as paragraphs, sentences, or words, there would be essentially no benefit but added expense. The only activity a smaller granularity lock would support is the ability to read parts of a document during the time that other parts of the same document are being edited.

Some applications could use both large- and small-grained locks. For instance, the bank database discussed in Example 9.20 clearly needs block- or tuple-level locking, but might also at some time need a lock on the entire accounts relation in order to audit accounts (e.g., check that the sum of the accounts is correct). However, taking a shared lock on the accounts relation, in order to compute some aggregation on the relation, while at the same time there are exclusive locks on individual account tuples can easily lead to unserializable behavior, because the relation is actually changing while a supposedly frozen copy of it is being read by the aggregation query.

### 9.6.2 Warning Locks

The solution to the problem of managing locks at different granularities involves a new kind of lock called a "warning." These locks are useful when the database elements form a nested or hierarchical structure, as suggested in Fig. 9.27. There, we see three levels of database elements:

1. Relations are the largest lockable elements.
2. Each relation is composed of one or more block or pages, on which its tuples are stored.
3. Each block contains one or more tuples.

The rules for managing locks on a hierarchy of database elements constitute the warning protocol, which involves both "ordinary" locks and "warning" locks. We shall describe the lock scheme where the ordinary locks are S and X (shared and exclusive). The warning locks will be denoted by prefixing / (for "intention to") to the ordinary locks, for example IS represents the intention to obtain a shared lock on a subelement. The rules of the warning protocol are:

1. To place an ordinary S or X lock on any element, we must begin at the root of the hierarchy.
2. If we are at the element that we want to lock, we need look no further. We request an S or X lock on that element.
3. If the element we wish to lock is further down the hierarchy, then we place a warning at this node; that is, if we want to get a shared lock on a subelement, we request an IS lock at this node, and if we want an exclusive lock on a subelement, we request an IX lock on this node. When the lock on the current node is granted, we proceed to the appropriate child (the one whose subtree contains the node we wish to lock). We then repeat step (2) or step (3), as appropriate, until we reach the desired node.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.28: Compatibility matrix for shared, exclusive, and intention locks

In order to decide whether or not one of these locks can be granted, we use the compatibility matrix of Fig. 9.28. To see why this matrix makes sense, consider first the IS column. When we request an IS lock on a node N, we intend to read a descendant of N. The only time this intent could create a problem is if some other transaction has already claimed the right to write a new copy of the entire database element represented by TV; thus we see "No" in the row for X. Notice that if some other transaction plans to write only a subelement, indicated by an IX lock at TV, then we can afford to grant the IS lock at TV, and allow the conflict to be resolved at a lower level, if indeed the intent to write and the intent to read happen to involve a common element.

Now consider the column for IX. If we intend to write a subelement of node TV, then we must prevent either reading or writing of the entire element.
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represented by $N$. Thus, we see "No" in the entries for lock modes $S$ and $X$. However, per our discussion of the $IS$ column, another transaction that reads or writes a subelement can have potential conflicts dealt with at that level, so $IX$ does not conflict with another $IX$ at $N$ or with an $IS$ at $N$.

Next, consider the column for $S$. Reading the element corresponding to node TV cannot conflict with either another read lock on TV or a read lock on some subelement of $N$, represented by $IS$ at TV. Thus, we see "Yes" in the rows for both $S$ and $IS$. However, either an $X$ or $IX$ means that some other transaction will write at least a part of the element represented by TV. Thus, we cannot grant the right to read all of TV, which explains the "No" entries in the column for $S$.

Finally, the column for $X$ has only "No" entries. We cannot allow writing of all of node $N$ if any other transaction already has the right to read or write TV, or to acquire that right on a subelement.

Example 9.21: Consider the relation

$\text{Movie}(\text{title, year, length, studioName})$

Let us postulate a lock on the entire relation and locks on individual tuples. Then transaction $T_1$, which consists of the query

\begin{verbatim}
SELECT *
FROM Movie
WHERE title = 'King Kong';
\end{verbatim}

starts by getting an 75 lock on the entire relation. It then moves to the individual tuples (there are two movies with the title $\text{King Kong}$), and gets $S$ locks on each of them.

Now, suppose that while we are executing the first query, transaction $T_2$, which changes the year component of a tuple, begins:

\begin{verbatim}
UPDATE Movie
SET year = 1939
WHERE title = 'Gone With the Wind';
\end{verbatim}

$T_2$ needs an $IX$ lock on the relation, since it plans to write a new value for one of the tuples. $T_1$'s $IS$ lock on the relation is compatible, so the lock is granted. When $T_2$ goes to the tuple for $\text{Gone With the Wind}$, it finds no lock there, and so gets its $X$ lock and rewrites the tuple. Had $T_2$ tried to write a new value in the tuple for one of the $\text{King Kong}$ movies, it would have had to wait until $T_1$ released its $S$ lock, since $S$ and $X$ are not compatible. The collection of locks is suggested by Fig. 9.29. □
Group Modes for Intention Locks

The compatibility matrix of Fig. 9.28 exhibits a situation we have not seen before regarding the power of lock modes. In prior lock schemes, whenever it was possible for a database element to be locked in both modes M and N at the same time, one of these modes dominates the other, in the sense that its row and column each has "No" in whatever positions the other mode's row or column, respectively, has "No." For example, in Fig. 9.19 we see that U dominates S, and X dominates both S and U. An advantage of knowing that there is always one dominant lock on an element is that we can summarize the effect of many locks with a "group mode," as discussed in Section 9.5.2.

As we see from Fig. 9.28, neither of modes S and IX dominate the other. Moreover, it is possible for an element to be locked in both modes S and IX at the same time, provided the locks are requested by the same transaction (recall that the "No" entries in a compatibility matrix only apply to locks held by some other transaction). A transaction might request both locks if it wanted to read an entire element and then write a small subset of its subelements. If a transaction has both S and IX locks on an element, then it restricts other transactions to the extent that either lock does. That is, we can imagine another lock mode SIX, whose row and column have "No" everywhere except in the entry for IS. The lock mode SIX serves as the group mode if there is a transaction with locks in S and IX modes, but not X mode.

Incidentally, we might imagine that the same situation occurs in the matrix of Fig 9.22 for increment locks. That is, one transaction could hold locks in both S and / modes. However, this situation is equivalent to holding a lock in X mode, so we could use X as the group mode in that situation.

9.6.3 Phantoms and Handling Insertions Correctly

When transactions create new subelements of a lockable element, there are some opportunities to go wrong. The problem is that we can only lock existing items; there is no easy way to lock database elements that do not exist but might later be inserted. The following example illustrates the point.

Example 9.22: Suppose we have the same Movie relation as in Example 9.21, and the first transaction to execute is $T_3$, which is the query

```sql
SELECT SUM(length)
FROM Movie
WHERE studioName = 'Disney';
```
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$T_3$ needs to read the tuples of all the Disney movies, so it might start by getting an IS lock on the relation and S locks on each of the tuples for Disney movies.\(^8\)

Now, a transaction $T_4$ comes along and inserts a new Disney movie. It seems that $T_4$ needs no locks, but it has made the result of $T_3$ incorrect. That fact by itself is not a concurrency problem, since the serial order $(T_3, T_4)$ is equivalent to what actually happened. However, there could also be some other element $X$ that both $T_3$ and $T_4$ write, with $T_4$ writing first, so there could be an unserializable behavior of more complex transactions.

To be more precise, suppose that $D_1$ and $D_2$ are pre-existing Disney movies, and $D_3$ is the new Disney movie inserted by $T_4$. Let $L$ be the sum of the lengths of the Disney movies computed by $T_3$, and assume the consistency constraint on the database is that $L$ should be equal to the sum of all the lengths of the Disney movies that existed the last time $L$ it was computed. Then the following is a sequence of events that is legal under the warning protocol:

$$r_3(D_1); r_3(D_2); w_4(D_3); w_4(X); w_3(L); w_3(X);$$

Here, we have used $w_4(D_3)$ to represent the creation of $D_3$ by transaction $T_4$. The schedule above is not serializable. In particular, the value of $L$ is not the sum of the lengths of $D_1$, $D_2$, and $D_3$, which are the current Disney movies. Moreover, the fact that $X$ has the value written by $T_3$ and not $T_4$ rules out the possibility that $T_3$ was ahead of $T_4$ in a supposed equivalent serial order.\(\square\)

The problem in Example 9.22 is that the new Disney movie has a phantom tuple, one that should have been locked but wasn’t, because it didn’t exist at the time the locks were taken. There is, however, a simple way 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. Thus, transaction $T_4$ in Example 9.22 must obtain an X lock on the relation Movie. Since $T_3$ has already locked this relation in mode IS, and that mode is not compatible with mode X, $T_4$ would have to wait until after $T_3$ completes.

\(^8\)However, if there were many Disney movies, it might be more efficient just to get an S lock on the entire relation.
9.6.4 Exercises for Section 9.6

Exercise 9.6.1: Consider, for variety, an object-oriented database. The objects of class C are stored on two blocks, B_1 and B_2. Block B_1 contains objects O_1 and O_2, while block B_2 contains objects O_3, O_4, and O_5. Class extents, blocks, and objects form a hierarchy of lockable database elements. Tell the sequence of lock requests and the response of a warning-protocol-based scheduler to the following sequences of requests. You may assume all requests occur just before they are needed, and all unlocks occur at the end of the transaction.

* a) r_1(O_1); w_2(O_2); r_2(O_2); w_1(O_1);
   b) r_1(O_3); w_2(O_5); r_2(O_3); w_1(O_1);
   c) r_1(O_1); r_1(O_3); r_2(O_1); w_2(O_3); w_2(O_5);
   d) r_1(O_1); r_2(O_2); r_3(O_3); w_1(O_3); w_2(O_4); w_3(O_5); w_1(O_2);

Exercise 9.6.2: Change the sequence of actions in Example 9.22 so that the w_4(D_3) action becomes a write by T_4 of the entire relation Movie. Then, show the action of a warning-protocol-based scheduler on this sequence of requests.

Exercise 9.6.3: Show how to add increment locks to a warning-protocol-based scheduler.

9.7 The Tree Protocol

In this section we consider another problem involving trees of elements. Section 9.6 dealt with trees that are formed by the nesting structure of the database elements, with the children being subparts of the parent. Now, we deal with tree structures that are formed by the link pattern of the elements themselves. Database elements are disjoint pieces of data, but the only way to get to a node is through its parent; B-trees are an important example of this sort of data. Knowing that we must traverse a particular path to an element gives us some important freedom to manage locks differently from the two-phase locking approaches we have seen so far.

9.7.1 Motivation for Tree-Based Locking

Let us consider a B-tree index, in a system that treats individual nodes (i.e., blocks) as lockable database elements. The node is the right level of lock granularity, because treating smaller pieces as elements offers no benefit, and treating the entire B-tree as one database element prevents the sort of concurrent use of the index that can be achieved via the mechanisms that form the subject of Section 9.7.

If we use a standard set of lock modes, like shared, exclusive, and update locks, and we use two-phase locking, then concurrent use of the B-tree almost
9.7. THE TREE PROTOCOL

impossible. The reason is that every transaction using the index must begin by locking the root node of the B-tree. If the transaction is 2PL, then it cannot unlock the root until it has acquired all the locks it needs, both on B-tree nodes and other database elements. Moreover, since in principle any transaction that inserts or deletes could wind up rewriting the root of the B-tree, the transaction needs at least an update lock on the root node, or an exclusive lock if update mode is not available. Thus, only one transaction that is not read-only can access the B-tree at any time.

However, in most situations, we can deduce almost immediately that a B-tree node will not be rewritten, even if the transaction inserts or deletes a tuple. For example, if the transaction inserts a tuple, but the child of the root that we visit is not completely full, then we know the insertion cannot propagate up to the root. Similarly, if the transaction deletes a single tuple, and the child of the root we visit has more than the minimum number of keys and pointers, then we can be sure the root will not change.

Thus, as soon as a transaction moves to a child of the root and observes the (quite usual) situation that rules out a rewrite of the root, we would like to release the lock on the root. The same observation applies to the lock on any interior node of the B-tree, although most of the opportunity for concurrent B-tree access comes from releasing locks on the root early. Unfortunately, releasing the lock on the root early will violate 2PL, so we cannot be sure that the schedule of several transactions accessing the B-tree will be serializable. The solution is a specialized protocol for transactions that access tree-structured data like B-trees. The protocol violates 2PL, but uses the fact that accesses to elements must proceed down the tree to assure serializability.

9.7.2 Rules for Access to Tree-Structured Data

The following restrictions on locks form the tree protocol. We assume that there is only one kind of lock, represented by lock requests of the form \( L_t(X) \), but the idea generalizes to any set of lock modes. We assume that transactions are consistent, and schedules must be legal (i.e., the scheduler will enforce the expected restrictions by granting locks only when they do not conflict with locks already at a node), but there is no two-phase locking requirement on transactions.

1. A transaction's first lock may be at any node of the tree.\(^{10}\)

2. Subsequent locks may only be acquired if the transaction currently has a lock on the parent node.

3. Nodes may be unlocked at any time.

\(^9\)Additionally, there are good reasons why a transaction will hold all its locks until it is ready to commit; see Section 9.1.\(^{10}\)In the B-tree example of Section 9.7.1, the first lock would always be at the root.
4. A transaction may not relock a node on which it has released a lock, even if it still holds a lock on the node's parent.

\[\text{Figure 9.30: A tree of lockable elements}\]

**Example 9.23**: Figure 9.30 shows a hierarchy of nodes, and Fig. 9.31 indicates the action of three transactions on this data. \(T_1\) starts at the root A, and proceeds downward to B, C, and D. \(T_2\) starts at B and tries to move to E, but its move is initially denied because of the lock by \(T_2\) on E. Transaction \(T_3\) starts at E and moves to F and G. Notice that \(T_1\) is not a 2PL transaction, because the lock on A is relinquished before the lock on D is acquired. Similarly, \(T_3\) is not a 2PL transaction, although \(T_2\) happens to be 2PL.

**9.7.3 Why the Tree Protocol Works**

The tree protocol forces a serial order on the transactions involved in a schedule. We can define an order of precedence as follows. Say that \(T_i <_S T_j\) if in schedule \(S\), the transactions \(T_i\) and \(T_j\) lock a node in common, and \(T_i\) locks the node first.

**Example 9.24**: In the schedule \(S\) of Fig 9.31, we find \(T_1\) and \(T_2\) lock B in common, and \(T_1\) locks it first. Thus, \(T_1 <_S T_2\). We also find that \(T_2\) and \(T_3\) lock E in common, and \(T_2\) locks it first; thus \(T_3 <_S T_2\). However, there is no precedence between \(T_1\) and \(T_3\), because they lock no node in common. Thus, the precedence graph derived from these precedence relations is as shown in Fig. 9.32.

If the precedence graph drawn from the precedence relations that we defined above has no cycles, then we claim that any topological order of the transactions is an equivalent serial schedule. For example, either \((T_1, T_3, T_2)\) or \((T_3, T_1, T_2)\) is an equivalent serial schedule for Fig. 9.31. The reason is that in such a serial
To understand why the precedence graph described above must always be acyclic, let us first observe the following:

- If two transactions lock several elements in common, then they are all locked in the same order.

Consider some transactions $T$ and $U$, which lock two or more items in common. First, notice that each transaction locks a set of elements that form a tree, and the intersection of two trees is itself a tree. Thus, there is some one highest element $X$ that both $T$ and $U$ lock. Suppose that $T$ locks $X$ first, but that there is some other element $Y$ that $U$ locks before $T$. Then there is a path in the tree of elements from $X$ to $Y$, and both $T$ and $U$ must lock each element along the path, because neither can lock a node without having a lock on its parent.

Consider the first element along this path, say $Z$, that $U$ locks first, as suggested by Fig. 9.33. Then $T$ locks the parent $P$ of $Z$ before $U$ does. But then $T$ is still holding the lock on $P$ when it locks $Z$, so $U$ has not yet locked $P$ when it locks $Z$. It cannot be that $Z$ is the first element $U$ locks in common with $T$, since they both lock ancestor $X$ (which could also be $P$, but not $Z$).
Thus, \( U \) cannot lock \( Z \) until after it has acquired a lock on \( P \), which is after \( T \) locks \( Z \). We conclude that \( T \) precedes \( U \) at every node they lock in common.

Now, consider an arbitrary set of transactions \( T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_n \) that obey the tree protocol and lock some of the nodes of a tree according to schedule \( S \). First, among those that lock the root, they do so in some order, and by the rule just observed:

- If \( T_i \) locks the root before \( T_j \), then \( T_i \) locks every node in common with \( T_j \) before \( T_j \) does. That is, \( T_i < S T_j \), but not \( T_j < S T_i \).

We can show by induction on the number of nodes of the tree that there is some serial order equivalent to \( S \) for the complete set of transactions.

**Basis:** If there is only one node, the root, then as we just observed, the order in which the transactions lock the root serves.

**Induction:** If there is more than one node in the tree, consider for each subtree of the root the set of transactions that lock one or more nodes in that
subtree. Note that transactions locking the root may belong to more than one subtree, but a transaction that does not lock the root will belong to only one of the subtrees. For instance, among the transactions of Fig. 9.31, only $T_1$ locks the root, and it belongs to both subtrees — the tree rooted at $B$ and the tree rooted at $C$. However, $T_2$ and $T_3$ belong only to the tree rooted at $B$.

By the inductive hypothesis, there is a serial order for all the transactions that lock nodes in any one subtree. We have only to blend the serial orders for the various subtrees. Since the only transactions these lists of transactions have in common are the transactions that lock the root, and we established that these transactions lock every node in common in the same order that they lock the root, it is not possible that two transactions locking the root appear in different orders in two of the sublists. Specifically, if $T_i$ and $T_j$ appear on the list for some child $C$ of the root, then they lock $C$ in the same order as they lock the root and therefore appear on the list in that order. Thus, we can build a serial order for the full set of transactions by starting with the transactions that lock the root, in their appropriate order, and interspersing those transactions that do not lock the root in any order consistent with the serial order of their subtrees.

**Example 9.25**: Suppose there are 10 transactions $T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_{10}$, and of these, $T_1, T_2$, and $T_3$ lock the root in that order. Suppose also that there are two children of the root, the first locked by $T_1$ through $T_5$ and the second locked by $T_2, T_3, T_5, T_9$, and $T_{10}$. Hypothetically, let the serial order for the first subtree be $(T_4, T_1, T_5, T_2, T_6, T_3, T_7)$; note that this order must include $T_1, T_2$, and $T_3$ in that order. Also, let the serial order for the second subtree be $(T_8, T_2, T_3, T_{10}, T_6)$. As must be the case, the transactions $T_5$ and $T_3$, which locked the root, appear in this sequence in the order in which they locked the root.

![Diagram](image.png)

Figure 9.34: Combining serial orders for the subtrees into a serial order for all transactions

The constraints imposed on the serial order of these transactions are as shown in Fig. 9.34. Solid lines represent constraints due to the order at the first child of the root, while dashed lines represent the order at the second child. $(T_4, T_8, T_1, T_5, T_2, T_9, T_6, T_{10}, T_3, T_7)$ is one of the many topological sorts of this graph. □
9.7.4 Exercises for Section 9.7

Exercise 9.7.1: Suppose we perform the following actions on the B-tree of Fig. 4.23. If we use the tree protocol, when can we release a write-lock on each of the nodes searched?

* a) Insert 10.
   b) Insert 20.
   c) Delete 5.
   d) Delete 23.

Exercise 9.7.2: Consider the following transactions that operate on the tree of Fig. 9.30.

\[ T_1: r_1(A); r_1(B); r_1(E); \]
\[ T_2: r_2(A); r_2(C); r_2(B); \]
\[ T_3: r_3(B); r_3(E); r_3(F); \]

Answer the following:

* a) In how many ways can \( T_1 \) and \( T_2 \) be interleaved, if they follow the tree protocol?
   b) In how many ways can \( T_1 \) and \( T_3 \) be interleaved, if they follow the tree protocol?
   c) In how many ways can all three be interleaved, if they follow the tree protocol?

Exercise 9.7.3: Suppose there are eight transactions \( T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_8 \), of which the odd-numbered transactions, \( T_1, T_3, T_5, \) and \( T_7 \), lock the root of a tree, in that order. There are three children of the root, the first locked by \( T_1, T_2, T_3, \) and \( T_4 \) in that order. The second child is locked by \( T_5, T_6, \) and \( T_7 \), in that order, and the third child is locked by \( T_8 \) and \( T_9 \), in that order. How many serial orders of the transactions are consistent with these statements?

Exercise 9.7.4: Suppose we use the tree protocol with shared and exclusive locks for reading and writing, respectively. Rule (2), which requires a lock on the parent to get a lock on a node, must be changed to prevent unserializable behavior. What is the proper rule (2) for shared and exclusive locks? Hint: Does the lock on the parent have to be of the same type as the lock on the child?
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9.8 Concurrency Control by Timestamps

Next, we shall consider two methods other than locking that are used in some systems to assure serializability of transactions:

1. **Timestamping.** We assign a "timestamp" to each transaction, record the timestamps of the transactions that last read and write each database element, and compare these values to assure that the serial schedule according to the transactions' timestamps is equivalent to the actual schedule of the transactions. This approach is the subject of the present section.

2. **Validation.** We examine timestamps of the transaction and the database elements when a transaction is about to commit; this process is called "validation" of the transaction. The serial schedule that orders transactions according to their validation time must be equivalent to the actual schedule. The validation approach is discussed in Section 9.9.

Both these approaches are optimistic, in the sense that they assume that no unserializable behavior will occur and only fix things up when a violation is apparent. In contrast, all locking methods assume that things will go wrong unless transactions are prevented in advance from engaging in nonserializable behavior. The optimistic approaches differ from locking in that the only remedy when something goes wrong is to abort and restart a transaction that tries to engage in unserializable behavior. In contrast, locking schedulers delay transactions, but do not abort them. Generally, optimistic schedulers are better than locking when many of the transactions are read-only, since those transactions can never by themselves cause unserializable behavior.

9.8.1 Timestamps

In order to use timestamping as a concurrency-control method, the scheduler needs to assign to each transaction T a unique number, its timestamp $TS(T)$. Timestamps must be issued in ascending order, at the time that a transaction first notifies the scheduler that it is beginning. Two approaches to generating timestamps are:

a) One possible way to create timestamps is to use the system clock, provided the scheduler does not operate so fast that it could assign timestamps to two transactions on one tick of the clock.

b) Another approach is for the scheduler to maintain a counter. Each time a transaction starts, the counter is incremented by 1, and the new value becomes the timestamp of the transaction. In this approach, timestamps

11That is not to say that a system using a locking scheduler will never abort a transaction; for instance, Section 10.3 discusses aborting transactions to fix deadlocks. However, a locking scheduler never uses a transaction abort simply as a response to a lock request that it cannot grant.
have nothing to do with "time," but they have the important property that we need for any timestamp-generating system: a transaction that starts later has a higher timestamp than a transaction that starts earlier.

Whatever method of generating timestamps is used, the scheduler must maintain a table of currently active transactions and their timestamps.

To use timestamps as a concurrency-control method, we need to associate with each database element $X$ two timestamps and an additional bit:

1. $RT(X)$, the read time of $X$, which is the highest timestamp of a transaction that has read $X$.
2. $WT(X)$, the write time of $X$, which is the highest timestamp of a transaction that has written $X$.
3. $C(X)$, the commit bit for $X$, which is true if and only if the most recent transaction to write $X$ has already committed. The purpose of this bit is to avoid a situation where one transaction $T$ reads data written by another transaction $U$, and $U$ then aborts. This problem, where $T$ makes a "dirty read" of uncommitted data, certainly can cause the database state to become inconsistent, and any scheduler needs a mechanism to prevent dirty reads.\(^{12}\)

### 9.8.2 Physically Unrealizable Behaviors

In order to understand the architecture and rules of a timestamp-based scheduler, we need to remember that the scheduler assumes that the timestamp order of transactions is also the serial order in which they must appear to execute. Thus, the job of the scheduler, in addition to assigning timestamps and updating $RT$, $WT$, and $C$ for the database elements, is to check that whenever a read or write occurs, what happens in real time could have happened if each transaction had executed instantaneously at the moment of its timestamp. If not, we say the behavior is physically unrealizable. There are two kinds of problems that can occur:

1. Read too late: Transaction $T$ tries to read database element $X$, but the write time of $X$ indicates that the current value of $X$ was written after $T$ theoretically executed; that is, $\text{ts}(T) < \text{wt}(X)$. Figure 9.35 illustrates the problem. The horizontal axis represents the real time at which events occur. Dotted lines link the actual events to the times at which they theoretically occur — the timestamp of the transaction that performs the event. Thus, we see a transaction $U$ that started after transaction $T$, but wrote a value for $X$ before $T$ reads $X$. $T$ should not be able to read the value written by $U$, because theoretically, $U$ executed after $T$ did. However, $T$ has no choice, because $U$'s value of $X$ is the one that $T$ now sees. The solution is to abort $T$ when the problem is encountered.

\(^{12}\)Although commercial systems generally give the user an option to allow dirty reads.
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2. Write too late: Transaction $T$ tries to write database element $X$, but the read time of $X$ indicates that some other transaction should have read the value written by $T$ but read some other value instead. That is, $WT(X) < TS(T) < RT(X)$. The problem is shown in Fig. 9.36. There we see a transaction $U$ that started after $T$, but read $X$ before $T$ got a chance to write $X$. When $T$ tries to write $X$, we find $RT(X) > TS(T)$, meaning that $X$ has already been read by a transaction $U$ that theoretically executed later than $T$. We also find $WT(X) < TS(T)$, which means that no other transaction wrote into $X$ a value that would have overwritten $T$’s value, thus, negating $T$’s responsibility to get its value into $X$ so transaction $U$ could read it.

9.8.3 Problems With Dirty Data

There is a class of problems that the commit bit is designed to help deal with. One of these problems, a "dirty read," is suggested in Fig. 9.37. There, transaction $T$ reads $X$, and $X$ was last written by $U$. The timestamp of $U$ is less than that of $T$, and the read by $T$ occurs after the write by $U$ in real time, so the event seems to be physically realizable. However, it is possible that after
T reads the value of X written by U, transaction U will abort; perhaps U encounters an error condition in its own data, such as a division by 0, or as we shall see in Section 9.8.4, the scheduler forces U to abort because it tries to do something physically unrealizable. Thus, although there is nothing physically unrealizable about T reading X, it is better to delay T's read until U commits or aborts. We can tell that U is not committed because the committed bit c(X) will be false.

Figure 9.37: T could perform a dirty read if it reads X when shown

A second potential problem is suggested by Fig. 9.38. Here, U, a transaction with a later timestamp than T, has written X first. When T tries to write, the appropriate action is to do nothing. Evidently no other transaction V that should have read T's value of X got U's value instead, because if V tried to read X, it would have aborted because of a too-late read. Future reads of X will want U's value or a later value of X, not T's value. This idea, that writes can be skipped when a write with a later write-time is already in place, is called the Thomas write rule.

Figure 9.38: A write is cancelled because of a write with a later timestamp, but the writer then aborts

There is a potential problem with the Thomas write rule, however. If U later aborts, as is suggested in Fig. 9.38, then its value of X should be removed and the previous value and write-time restored. Since T is committed, it would seem that the value of X should be the one written by T for future reading.
However, we already skipped the write by $T$ and it is too late to repair the damage.

While there are many ways to deal with the problems just described, we shall adopt a relatively simple policy based on the following assumed capability of the timestamp-based scheduler.

- When a transaction $T$ writes a database element $X$, the write is "tentative" and may be undone if $T$ aborts. The commit bit $C(X)$ is set to false, and the scheduler makes a copy of the old value of $X$ and its previous $WT(X)$.

### 9.8.4 The Rules for Timestamp-Based Scheduling

We can now summarize the rules that a scheduler using timestamps must follow to make sure that nothing physically unrealizable may occur. The scheduler, in response to a read or write request from a transaction $T$ has the choice of:

a) Granting the request,

b) Aborting $T$ (if $T$ would violate physical reality) and restarting $T$ with a new timestamp (abort followed by restart is often called rollback), or

c) Delaying $T$ and later deciding whether to abort $T$ or to grant the request (if the request is a read, and the read might be dirty, as in Section 9.8.3).

The rules are as follows:

1. Suppose the scheduler receives a request $r_T(X)$.
   a) If $TS(T) > WT(X)$, the read is physically realizable.
      i. If $C(X)$ is true, grant the request. If $TS(T) > RT(X)$, set $RT(X) := TS(T)$; otherwise do not change $RT(X)$.
      ii. If $C(X)$ is false, delay $T$ until $C(X)$ becomes true or the transaction that wrote $X$ aborts.
   b) If $TS(T) < WT(X)$, the read is physically unrealizable. Rollback $T$; that is, abort $T$ and restart it with a new, larger timestamp.

2. Suppose the scheduler receives a request $w_T(X)$.
   a) If $TS(T) > RT(X)$ and $TS(T) > WT(X)$, the write is physically realizable and must be performed.
      i. Write the new value for $X$,
      ii. Set $WT(X) := TS(T)$, and
      iii. Set $C(X) := false$. 
(b) If $TS(T) > RT(X)$, but $TS(T) < WT(X)$, then the write is physically realizable, but there is already a later value in $X$. If $C(X)$ is true, then the previous writer of $X$ is committed, and we simply ignore the write by $T$; we allow $T$ to proceed and make no change to the database. However, if $C(X)$ is false, then we must delay $T$ as in point 1(a)ii.

(c) If $TS(T) < RT(X)$, then the write is physically unrealizable, and $T$ must be rolled back.

3. Suppose the scheduler receives a request to commit $T$. It must find (using a list the scheduler maintains) all the database elements $X$ written by $T$, and set $C(X) := true$. If any transactions are waiting for $X$ to be committed (found from another scheduler-maintained list), these transactions are allowed to proceed.

4. Suppose the scheduler receives a request to abort $T$ or decides to rollback $T$ as in 1b or 2c. Then any transaction that was waiting on an element $X$ that $T$ wrote must repeat its attempt to read or write, and see whether the action is now legal after the aborted transaction’s writes are cancelled.

Example 9.26: Figure 9.39 shows a schedule of three transactions, $T_1$, $T_2$, and $T_3$ that access three database elements, $A$, $B$, and $C$. The real time at which events occur increases down the page, as usual. However, we have also indicated the timestamps of the transactions and the read and write times of the elements. We assume that at the beginning, each of the database elements has both a read and write time of 0. The timestamps of the transactions are acquired when they notify the scheduler that they are beginning. Notice that even though $T_1$ executes the first data access, it does not have the least timestamp. Presumably $T_2$ was the first to notify the scheduler of its start, and $T_3$ did so next, with $T_1$ last to start.

Figure 9.39: Three transactions executing under a timestamp-based scheduler
In the first action, $T_1$ reads $B$. Since the write time of $B$ is less than the timestamp of $T'_1$, this read is physically realizable and allowed to happen. The read time of $B$ is set to 200, the timestamp of $T'_1$. The second and third read actions similarly are legal and result in the read time of each database element being set to the timestamp of the transaction that read it.

At the fourth step, $T_1$ writes $B$. Since the read time of $B$ is not bigger than the timestamp of $T'_1$, the write is physically realizable. Since the write time of $B$ is no larger than the timestamp of $T'_1$, we must actually perform the write. When we do, the write time of $B$ is raised to 200, the timestamp of the writing transaction $T'_1$.

Next, $T_2$ tries to write $C$. However, $C$ was already read by transaction $T_3$, which theoretically executed at time 175, while $T_2$ would have written its value at time 150. Thus, $T_2$ is trying to do something that would result in physically unrealizable behavior, and $T_2$ must be rolled back.

The last step is the write of $A$ by $T'_3$. Since the read time of $A$, 150, is less than the timestamp of $T'_3$, 175, the write is legal. However, there is already a later value of $A$ stored in that database element, namely the value written by $T_1$, theoretically at time 200. Thus, $T'_3$ is not rolled back, but neither does it write its value. □

### 9.8.5 Multiversion Timestamps

An important variation of timestamping maintains old versions of database elements in addition to the current version that is stored in the database itself. The purpose is to allow reads $r_T(X)$ that otherwise would cause transaction $T$ to abort (because the current version of $X$ was written in $T$'s future) to proceed by reading the version of $X$ that is appropriate for a transaction with $T$'s timestamp. The method is especially useful if database elements are disk blocks or pages, since then all that must be done is for the buffer manager to keep in memory certain blocks that might be useful for some currently active transaction.

**Example 9.27:** Consider the set of transactions accessing database element $A$ shown in Fig. 9.40. These transactions are operating under an ordinary timestamp-based scheduler, and when $T'_1$ tries to read $A$, it finds $w_{T}(A)$ to be greater than its own timestamp, and must abort. However, there is an old value of $A$ written by $T_1$ and overwritten by $T'_2$ that would have been suitable for $T'_1$ to read; this version of $A$ had a write time of 150, which is less than $T'_1$'s timestamp of 175. If this old value of $A$ were available, $T'_1$ could be allowed to read it, even though it is not the "current" value of $A$. □

A multiversion timestamping scheduler differs from the scheduler described in Section 9.8.4 in the following ways:

1. When a new write $w_T(X)$ occurs, if it is legal, then a new version of database element $X$ is created. Its write time is $\text{TS}(T)$, and we shall refer to it as $X_t$, where $t = \text{TS}(T)$. 
Figure 9.40: \( T_3 \) must abort because it cannot access an old value of \( A \)

2. When a read \( r_j(X) \) occurs, the scheduler finds the version \( X_{t'} \) of \( X \) such that \( t < T_S(T) \), but there is no other version \( X_{t''} \) with \( t < t' < T_S(T) \). That is, the version of \( X \) written immediately before \( T \) theoretically executed is the version that \( T \) reads.

3. Write times are associated with versions of an element, and they never change.

4. Read times are also associated with versions. They are used to reject certain writes, namely one whose time is less than the read time of the previous version. Figure 9.41 suggests the problem, where \( X \) has versions \( X_{50} \) and \( X_{100} \), the former was read at time 80, and a new write by a transaction \( T \) whose timestamp is 60 occurs. This write must cause \( T \) to abort, because its value of \( X \) should have been read by the transaction with timestamp 80, had \( T \) been allowed to execute.

5. When a version \( X_t \) has a write time \( t \) such that no active transaction has a timestamp less than \( t \), then we may delete any version of \( X \) previous to \( X_t \).

Example 9.28: Let us reconsider the actions of Fig. 9.40 if multiversion timestamping is used. First, there are three versions of \( A \): \( A_0 \), which exists before these transactions start, \( A_{100} \), written by \( T_1 \), and \( A_{200} \), written by \( T_2 \). Figure 9.42 shows the sequence of events, when the versions are created, and when they are read. Notice in particular that \( T_3 \) does not have to abort, because it can read an earlier version of \( A \).

9.8.6 Timestamps and Locking

Generally, timestamping is superior in situations where either most transactions are read-only, or it is rare that concurrent transactions will try to read and
9.8. CONCURRENCY CONTROL BY TIMESTAMPS

Figure 9.41: A transaction tries to write a version of \( X \) that would make events physically unrealizable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( T_1 )</th>
<th>( T_2 )</th>
<th>( T_3 )</th>
<th>( T_4 )</th>
<th>( A_0 )</th>
<th>( A_{150} )</th>
<th>( A_{200} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Create</td>
<td>Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_1(A) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( w_1(A) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_2(A) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create</td>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( w_2(A) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_3(A) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td>Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_4(A) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.42: Execution of transactions using multiversion concurrency control

write the same element. In high-conflict situations, locking performs better. The argument for this rule-of-thumb is:

- Locking will frequently delay transactions as they wait for locks, and can even lead to deadlocks, where several transactions wait for a long time, and then one has to be rolled back.

- But if concurrent transactions frequently read and write elements in common, then rollbacks will be frequent, introducing even more delay than a locking system.

There is an interesting compromise used in several commercial systems. The scheduler divides the transactions into read-only transactions and read/write transactions. Read/write transactions are executed using two-phase locking, to keep both each other and read-only transactions from accessing the elements they lock.

Read-only transactions are executed using multiversion timestamping. As the read/write transactions create new versions of a database element, those
versions are managed as in Section 9.8.5. A read-only transaction is allowed to read whatever version of a database element is appropriate for its timestamp. A read-only transaction thus never has to abort, and will only rarely be delayed.

9.8.7 Exercises for Section 9.8

Exercise 9.8.1: Below are several sequences of events, including start events, where sti means that transaction \( T_i \) starts. These sequences represent real time, and the timestamp-based scheduler will allocate timestamps to transactions in the order of their starts. Tell what happens as each executes.

- a) \( st_1; st_2; r_1(A); r_2(B); w_2(A); w_1(B); \)
- b) \( st_1; r_1(A); st_2; w_2(B); r_2(A); w_1(B); \)
- c) \( st_1; st_2; st_3; r_1(A); r_2(B); w_1(C); r_3(B); r_4(C); w_2(B); w_3(A); \)
- d) \( st_1; st_3; st_2; r_1(A); r_2(B); w_1(C); r_3(B); r_4(C); w_2(B); w_3(A); \)

Exercise 9.8.2: Tell what happens during the following sequences of events if a multiversion, timestamp-based scheduler is used. What happens instead, if the scheduler does not maintain multiple versions?

- a) \( st_1; st_2; st_3; st_4; w_1(A); w_2(A); w_3(A); r_2(A); r_4(A); \)
- b) \( st_1; st_2; st_3; st_4; w_1(A); w_2(A); r_4(A); r_2(A); \)
- c) \( st_1; st_2; st_3; st_4; w_1(A); w_4(A); r_3(A); w_2(A); \)

Exercise 9.8.3: We observed in our study of lock-based schedulers that there are several reasons why transactions that obtain locks could deadlock. Can a timestamp-based scheduler using the commit bit \( C(X) \) have a deadlock?

9.9 Concurrency Control by Validation

Validation is another type of optimistic concurrency control, where we allow transactions to access data without locks, and at the appropriate time we check that the transaction has behaved in a serializable manner. Validation differs from timestamping principally in that the scheduler maintains a record of what active transactions are doing, rather than keeping read and write times for all database elements. Just before a transaction starts to write values of database 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 active transactions. Should there be a risk of physically unrealizable behavior, the transaction is rolled back.
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9.9.1 Architecture of a Validation-Based Scheduler

When validation is used as the concurrency-control mechanism, the scheduler must be told for each transaction \( T \) the set of database elements \( T \) reads and the set of elements \( T \) writes. These sets are the read set, \( RS(T) \), and the write set, \( WS(T) \), respectively. Transactions are executed in three phases:

1. Read. In the first phase, the transaction reads from the database all the elements in its read set. The transaction also computes in its local address space all the results it is going to write.

2. Validate. In the second phase, the scheduler \( \text{validates} \) the transaction by comparing its read and write sets with those of other transactions. We shall describe the validation process in Section 9.9.2. If validation fails, then the transaction is rolled back; otherwise it proceeds to the third phase.

3. Write. In the third phase, the transaction writes to the database its values for the elements in its write set.

Intuitively, we may think of each transaction that successfully validates as executing at the moment that it validates. Thus, the validation-based scheduler has an assumed serial order of the transactions to work with, and it bases its decision to validate or not on whether the transactions’ behaviors are consistent with this serial order.

To support the decision whether to validate a transaction, the scheduler maintains three sets:

1. \( \text{START} \), the set of transactions that have started, but not yet completed validation. For each transaction \( T \) in this set, the scheduler maintains \( \text{START}(T) \), the time at which \( T \) started.

2. \( \text{VAL} \), the set of transactions that have been validated but not yet finished the writing of phase 3. For each transaction \( T \) in this set, the scheduler maintains both \( \text{START}(T) \) and \( \text{VAL}(T) \), the time at which \( T \) validated. Note that \( \text{VAL}(T) \) is also the time at which \( T \) is imagined to execute in the hypothetical serial order of execution.

3. \( \text{FIN} \), the set of transactions that have completed phase 3. For these transactions \( T \), the scheduler records \( \text{START}(T) \), \( \text{VAL}(T) \), and \( \text{FIN}(T) \), the time at which \( T \) finished. In principle this set grows, but as we shall see, we do not have to remember transaction \( T \) if \( \text{FIN}(T) < \text{START}(U) \) for any active transaction \( U \) (i.e., for any \( U \) in \( \text{START} \) or \( \text{VAL} \)). The scheduler may thus periodically purge the \( \text{FIN} \) set to keep its size from growing beyond bounds.


9.9.2 The Validation Rules

If maintained by the scheduler, the information of Section 9.9.1 is enough for it to detect any potential violation of the assumed serial order of the transactions — the order in which the transactions validate. To understand the rules, let us first consider what can be wrong when we try to validate a transaction T.

1. Suppose there is a transaction U such that:
   (a) U is in VAL or FIN; that is, U has validated.
   (b) FIN(U) > START(T); that is, U did not finish before T started.\textsuperscript{13}
   (c) RS(T) n WS(U) is not empty; in particular, let it contain database element X.

Then it is possible that U wrote X after T read X. In fact, U may not even have written X yet. A situation where U wrote X, but not in time is shown in Fig. 9.43. To interpret the figure, note that the dotted lines connect the events in real time with the time at which they would have occurred had transactions been executed at the moment they validated. Since we don't know whether or not T got to read U's value, we must rollback T to avoid a risk that the actions of T and U will not be consistent with the assumed serial order.

2. Suppose there is a transaction U such that:
   (a) U is in VAL; i.e., U has successfully validated.
   (b) FIN(Z7) > VAL(T); that is, U did not finish before T entered its validation phase.

\textsuperscript{13}Note that if U is in VAL, then U has not yet finished when T validates. In that case, FIN(U) is technically undefined. However, we know it must be larger than START(T) in this case.
(c) \( \text{ws}(T) \cap \text{ws}(U) \neq 0 \); in particular, let \( X \) be in both write sets.

Then the potential problem is as shown in Fig. 9.44. \( T \) and \( U \) must both write values of \( X \), and if we let \( T \) validate, it is possible that it will write \( X \) before \( U \) does. Since we cannot be sure, we rollback \( T \) to make sure it does not violate the assumed serial order in which it follows \( U \).

\[
\text{T writes X} \\
\text{U writes X}
\]

\[
\text{U validated} \quad \text{T validating} \quad \text{U finish}
\]

Figure 9.44: \( T \) cannot validate if it could then write something ahead of an earlier transaction.

The two problems described above are the only situations in which a write by \( T \) could be physically unrealizable. In Fig. 9.43, if \( U \) finished before \( T \) started, then surely \( T \) would read the value of \( X \) that either \( U \) or some later transaction wrote. In Fig. 9.44, if \( U \) finished before \( T \) validated, then surely \( U \) wrote \( X \) before \( T \) did. We may thus summarize these observations with the following rule for validating a transaction \( T \):

- Compare \( \text{RS}(T) \) with \( \text{ws}(U) \) and check that \( \text{RS}(T) \cap \text{ws}(U) = 0 \) for any \( U \) that did not finish before \( T \) started, i.e., if \( \text{FIN}(U) > \text{START}(T) \).
- Compare \( \text{ws}(T) \) with \( \text{WS}(U) \) and check that \( \text{ws}(T) \cap \text{WS}(U) = 0 \) for any \( U \) that did not finish before \( T \) validated, i.e., if \( \text{FIN}(U) > \text{VAL}(T) \).

**Example 9.29**: Figure 9.45 shows a time line during which four transactions \( T \), \( U \), \( V \), and \( W \) attempt to execute and validate. The read and write sets for each transaction are indicated on the diagram. \( T \) starts first, although \( U \) is the first to validate.

1. Validation of \( U \): When \( U \) validates there are no other validated transactions, so there is nothing to check. \( U \) validates successfully and writes a value for database element \( D \).

2. Validation of \( T \): When \( T \) validates, \( U \) is validated but not finished. Thus, we must check that neither the read nor write set of \( T \) has anything in common with \( \text{ws}(U) = \{D\} \). Since \( \text{RS}(T) = \{A,B\} \), and \( \text{WS}(T) = \{A,C\} \), both checks are successful, and \( T \) validates.
3. Validation of V: When V validates, U is validated and finished, and T is validated but not finished. Also, V started before U finished. Thus, we must compare both RS(V) and WS(V) against WS(T), but only RS(V) needs to be compared against WS(U). We find:

- \( RS(V) \cap WS(T) = \{ B \} \cap \{ A, C \} = \emptyset. \)
- \( WS(V') \cap WS(T) = \{ D, E \} \cap \{ A, C \} = \emptyset. \)
- \( RS(V) \cap WS(U) = \{ B \} \cap \{ D \} = \emptyset. \)

Thus, V also validates successfully.

4. Validation of W: When W validates, we find that U finished before W started, so no comparison between W and U is performed. T is finished before W validates but did not finish before W started, so we compare only RS(W) with WS(T). V is validated but not finished, so we need to compare both RS(W) and WS(W) with WS(T). These tests are:

- \( RS(W) \cap WS(T) = \{ A, D \} \cap \{ A, C \} = \{ A \}. \)
- \( RS(W) \cap WS(V) = \{ A, D \} \cap \{ D, E \} = \{ D \}. \)
- \( WS(W) \cap WS(V) = \{ A, C \} \cap \{ D, E \} = \emptyset. \)

Since the intersections are not all empty, W is not validated. Rather, W is rolled back and does not write values for A or C.
9.9. CONCURRENCY CONTROL BY VALIDATION

**Just a Moment**

You may have been concerned with a tacit notion that validation takes place in a moment, or indivisible instant of time. For example, we imagine that we can decide whether a transaction \( U \) has already validated before we start to validate transaction \( T \). Could \( U \) perhaps finish validating while we are validating \( T \)?

If we are running on a uniprocessor system, and there is only one scheduler process, we can indeed think of validation and other actions of the scheduler as taking place in an instant of time. The reason is that if the scheduler is validating \( T \), then it cannot also be validating \( U \), so all during the validation of \( T \), the validation status of \( U \) cannot change.

If we are running on a multiprocessor, and there are several scheduler processes, then it might be that one is validating \( T \) while the other is validating \( U \). If so, then we need to rely on whatever synchronization mechanism the multiprocessor system provides to make validation an atomic action.

### 9.9.3 Comparison of Three Concurrency-Control Mechanisms

The three approaches to serializability that we have considered — locks, timestamps, and validation — each have their advantages. First, they can be compared for their storage utilization:

- **Locks**: Space in the lock table is proportional to the number of database elements locked.

- **Timestamps**: In a naive implementation, space is needed for read- and write-times with every database element, whether or not it is currently accessed. However, a more careful implementation will treat all timestamps that are prior to the earliest active transaction as "minus infinity" and not record them. In that case, we can store read- and write-times in a table analogous to a lock table, in which only those database elements that have been accessed recently are mentioned at all.

- **Validation**: Space is used for timestamps and read/write sets for each currently active transaction, plus a few more transactions that finished after some currently active transaction began.

Thus, the amounts of space used by each approach is approximately proportional to the sum over all active transactions of the number of database elements the transaction accesses. Timestamping and validation may use slightly more space because they keep track of certain accesses by recently committed transactions that a lock table would not record. A potential problem with validation
is that the write set for a transaction must be known before the writes occur (but after the transaction's local computation has been completed).

We can also compare the methods for their effect on the ability of transactions to complete without delay. The performance of the three methods depends on whether interaction among transactions (the likelihood that a transaction will access an element that is also being accessed by a concurrent transaction) is high or low.

- Locking delays transactions but avoids rollbacks, even when interaction is high. Timestamps and validation do not delay transactions, but can cause them to rollback, which is a more serious form of delay and also wastes resources.

- If interference is low, then neither timestamps nor validation will cause many rollbacks, and may be preferable to locking because they generally have lower overhead than a locking scheduler.

- When a rollback is necessary, timestamps catch some problems earlier than validation, which always lets a transaction do all its internal work before considering whether the transaction must rollback.

9.9.4 Exercises for Section 9.9

Exercise 9.9.1: In the following sequences of events, we use \( R_t(X) \) to mean "transaction \( T_t \) starts, and its read set is the list of database elements \( X \)." Also, \( V_t \) means "\( T_t \) attempts to validate," and \( W_t(X) \) means that "\( T_t \) finishes, and its write set was \( X \)." Tell what happens when each sequence is processed by a validation-based scheduler.

* a)  \( R_1(A, B); R_2(B, C); V_1; R_3(C, D); V_5; W_1(A); V_2; W_2(A); W_3(B); \)

b)  \( R_1(A, B); R_2(B, C); V_1; R_3(C, D); V_5; W_1(A); V_2; W_2(A); W_3(D); \)

c)  \( R_1(A, B); R_2(B, C); V_1; R_3(C, D); V_5; W_1(C); V_2; W_2(A); W_3(D); \)

d)  \( R_1(A, B); R_2(B, C); R_3(C); V_1; V_2; V_3; W_1(A); W_2(B); W_3(C); \)

e)  \( R_1(A, B); R_2(B, C); R_3(C); V_1; V_2; V_3; W_1(C); W_2(B); W_3(A); \)

f)  \( R_1(A, B); R_2(B, C); R_3(C); V_1; V_2; V_3; W_1(A); W_2(C); W_3(B); \)

9.10 Summary of Chapter 9

* Consistent Database States: Database states that obey whatever implied or declared constraints the designers intended are called consistent. It is essential that operations on the database preserve consistency, that is, they turn one consistent database state into another.
4 Consistency of Concurrent Transactions: It is normal for several transactions to have access to a database at the same time. Transactions, run in isolation, are assumed to preserve consistency of the database. It is the job of the scheduler to assure that concurrently operating transactions also preserve the consistency of the database.

4 Schedules: Transactions are broken into actions, mainly reading and writing from the database. A sequence of these actions from one or more transactions is called a schedule.

4 Serial Schedules: If transactions execute one at a time, the schedule is said to be serial.

4 Serializable Schedules: A schedule that is equivalent in its effect on the database to some serial schedule is said to be serializable. Interleaving of actions from several transactions is possible in a serializable schedule that is not itself serial, but we must be very careful what sequences of actions we allow, or an interleaving will leave the database in an inconsistent state.

4 Conflict-Serializability: A simple-to-test, sufficient condition for serializability is that the schedule can be made serial by a sequence of swaps of adjacent actions without conflicts. Such a schedule is called conflict-serializable. A conflict occurs if we try to swap two actions of the same transaction, or to swap two actions that access the same database element, at least one of which actions is a write.

4 Precedence Graphs: An easy test for conflict-serializability is to construct a precedence graph for the schedule. Nodes correspond to transactions, and there is an arc \( T \rightarrow U \) if some action of \( T \) in the schedule conflicts with a later action of \( U \). A schedule is conflict-serializable if and only if the precedence graph is acyclic.

4 Locking: The most common approach to assuring serializable schedules is to lock database elements before accessing them, and to release the lock after finishing access to the element. Locks on an element prevent other transactions from accessing the element.

4 Two-Phase Locking: Locking by itself does not assure serializability. However, two-phase locking, in which all transactions first enter a phase where they only acquire locks, and then enter a phase where they only release locks, will guarantee serializability.

4 Lock Modes: To avoid locking out transactions unnecessarily, systems usually use several lock modes, with different rules for each mode about when a lock can be granted. Most common is the system with shared locks for read-only access and exclusive locks for accesses that include writing.
Compatibility Matrices: A compatibility matrix is a useful summary of when it is legal to grant a lock in a certain lock mode, given that there may be other locks, in the same or other modes, on the same element.

Update Locks: A scheduler can allow a transaction that plans to read and then write an element first to take an update lock, and later to upgrade the lock to exclusive. Update locks can be granted when there are already shared locks on the element, but once there, an update lock prevents other locks from being granted on that element.

Increment Locks: For the common case where a transaction wants only to add or subtract a constant from an element, an increment lock is suitable. Increment locks on the same element do not conflict with each other, although they conflict with shared and exclusive locks.

Locking Elements With a Granularity Hierarchy: When both large and small elements — relations, disk blocks, and tuples, perhaps — may need to be locked, a warning system of locks enforces serializability. Transactions place intention locks on large elements to warn other transactions that they plan to access one or more of its subelements.

Locking Elements Arranged in a Tree: If database elements are only accessed by moving down a tree, as in a B-tree index, then a non-two-phase locking strategy can enforce serializability. The rules require a lock to be held on the parent while obtaining a lock on the child, although the lock on the parent can then be released and additional locks taken later.

Optimistic Concurrency Control: Instead of locking, a scheduler can assume transactions will be serializable, and abort a transaction if some potentially nonserializable behavior is seen. This approach, called optimistic, is divided into timestamp-based, and validation-based scheduling.

Timestamp-Based Schedulers: This type of scheduler assigns timestamps to transactions as they begin. Database elements have associated read- and write-times, which are the timestamps of the transactions that most recently performed those actions. If an impossible situation, such as a read by one transaction of a value that was written in that transaction's future is detected, the violating transaction is rolled back, i.e., aborted and restarted.

Validation-Based Schedulers: These schedulers validate transactions after they have read everything they need, but before they write. Transactions that have read, or will write, an element that some other transaction is in the process of writing, will have an ambiguous result, so the transaction is not validated. A transaction that fails to validate is rolled back.

Multiversion Timestamps: A common technique in practice is for read-only transactions to be scheduled by timestamps, but with multiple versions, where a write of an element does not overwrite earlier values of that
element until all transactions that could possibly need the earlier value have finished. Writing transactions are scheduled by conventional locks.

9.11 References for Chapter 9

The book [6] is an important source for material on scheduling, as well as locking. [3] is another important source. Two recent surveys of concurrency control are [12] and [11].

Probably the most significant paper in the field of transaction processing is [4] on two-phase locking. The warning protocol for hierarchies of granularity is from [5]. Non-two-phase locking for trees is from [10]. The compatibility matrix was introduced to study behavior of lock modes in [7].

Timestamps as a concurrency control method appeared in [2] and [1]. Scheduling by validation is from [8]. The use of multiple versions was studied by [9].


