Overview of Transaction Management

Chapter 16
Database Transactions

- A transaction is the DBMS’s abstract view of a user program: a sequence of database commands; disk reads and writes.

- Concurrent execution of user programs is essential for good DBMS performance.
  - Because disk accesses are frequent, and relatively slow, it is important to keep the CPU busy by working on several user programs concurrently.

- A user’s program may carry out many consecutive operations on the data retrieved from the database, but the DBMS is only concerned about what data is read/written from/to the database.
ACID Properties of Transactions

- **Atomic**: the end effect of a transaction should be *all or nothing*. Either it is executed to completion, or it is as if it never happened. (DBMS provides this)
- **Consistency**: Every transaction must preserve all constraints of the database. (User and DBMS)
- **Isolation**: The result of a transaction should give predictable results regardless of any concurrent transactions. (DBMS)
- **Durability**: Transactions must tolerate crashes and being aborted before completion allowing the database to be recoverable to a consistent state. (DBMS)
Concurrency in a DBMS

- Users submit a transaction, and can think of it as executing *by itself* on the database.
  - Concurrency is provided by the DBMS, which interleaves the actions (reads/writes) of many transactions.
  - Each transaction must leave the database in a consistent state if the DB was consistent when the transaction began.
  - DBMSs only enforce Integrity Constraints
  - Beyond this, the DBMS does not understand the data. (e.g., it does not understand how interest on a bank account is computed).

- **Issues:** Effect of *interleaving transactions* and *crashes.*
Interleaving’s Impact

- Interleaving improves database performance
  - While one transaction waits for pages to be read from disk, the CPU processes other transactions. I/Os proceed in parallel with CPU activity (greater system utilization)
  - Increased system throughput (transactions/sec)
  - More “fair” than true sequential access; allows all pending transactions to make progress (heavy transactions, don’t starve out light ones)
  - Predictable latency (delay from request to completion)

- However, interleaving can lead to anomalies
  - Sequential inconsistency
Example

- Consider two transactions (\textit{Xacts}): 

\begin{center}
| T1: BEGIN c=c+100, s=s-100 END |
| T2: BEGIN c=1.02*c, s=1.04*s END |
\end{center}

- Intuitively, the first transaction is transferring $100 from a savings to a checking account. The second is crediting both accounts interest payments.

- There is no guarantee that T1 will execute before T2 or vice-versa, if both are submitted together. However, the net effect \textit{must} be equivalent to some execution of these two transactions run sequentially.
Example (Contd.)

- Consider a possible interleaving (schedule):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1:</th>
<th>T2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c = c + 100,</td>
<td>c = 1.02 * c,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s = s - 100</td>
<td>s = 1.04 * s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This is OK. But what about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1:</th>
<th>T2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c = c + 100,</td>
<td>c = 1.02 * c,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s = s - 100</td>
<td>s = 1.04 * s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The DBMS’s view of the second schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1:</th>
<th>T2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( R_1(c) ), ( W_1(c) ),</td>
<td>( R_1(s) ), ( W_1(s) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_2(c) ), ( W_2(c) ), ( R_2(s) ), ( W_2(s) ),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scheduling Transactions

- **Serial schedule**: Schedule that does not interleave the actions of different transactions.

- **Equivalent schedules**: For any database state, the effect (on the set of objects in the database) of executing the first schedule is identical to the effect of executing the second schedule.

- **Serializable schedule**: A schedule that is equivalent to some serial execution of the transactions.

(Note: If each transaction preserves consistency, every serializable schedule also preserves consistency.)
Atomicity of Transactions

- An important property guaranteed by the DBMS is that transactions are **atomic**. That is, a user can think of a Xact as either always executing all its actions in one step, or not executing any actions at all.

- A transaction might **commit** after completing all its actions, or it could **abort** (or be aborted by the DBMS) after executing some actions.

- DBMS **logs** all actions so that it can **undo** aborted transactions.
The 3 Classes of Anomalies

- Reading Uncommitted Data--
  Write-Read (WR) Conflict, “dirty reads”:

| T1:   | R(a), W(a),       | R(b), W(b), Abort |
| T2:   | R(a), W(a), R(b), W(b), C, |

- Unrepeatable Reads--
  Read-Write (RW) Conflict:

| T1:   | R(a), W(a), R(b), W(b), C, |
| T2:   | R(a), W(a), R(b), W(b), C, |

T2’s write of A is lost
Anomalies (Continued)

- Overwriting Uncommitted Data

**Write-Write (WW) Conflict, “blind write”:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1:</th>
<th>W(a),</th>
<th>W(b), C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td>W(a), W(b), C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1’s write of a is lost

- All 3 anomalies involve at least one write
- How do we avoid these?
Lock-Based Concurrency Control

- **Strict Two-phase Locking (Strict 2PL) Protocol:**
  - Each Xact must obtain a *shared (S)* lock on object before reading, and an *exclusive (X)* lock on object before writing. (of course, you can both read and write an object with an X lock)
  - All locks held by a transaction are released when the transaction completes (at Commit or Abort)
  - If an Xact holds an X lock on an object, no other Xact can get either an S or X lock on that object.
- **Strict 2PL allows only serializable schedules.**
  - Additionally, it simplifies aborts (more soon)
Examples

- **Common case:** Xacts affect different parts of db.  
  T1: $b = f(b, a)$, T2: $c = g(c, a)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1:</th>
<th>S(a), R(a),</th>
<th>X(b), R(b), W(b), C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td>S(a), R(a), X(c), R(c), W(c), C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Hot spots:** Xacts reference a common record.  
  T1: $a = f(a)$,  T2: $b = f(b, a)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1:</th>
<th>X(a), R(a),</th>
<th>W(a), C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td>S(a), ...</td>
<td>R(a), X(b), R(b), W(b), C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1:</th>
<th>X(a), ...</th>
<th>R(a), W(a), C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2:</td>
<td>S(a), R(a), X(b), R(b), W(b), C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Deadlocks

- Transactions request exclusive access to a common locked record. T1: \( b = f(b, a) \), T2: \( a = g(a, b) \)

| T1: S(a),R(a),X(b),R(b), W(b),C | T2: S(b),... R(b),X(a),R(a),W(a),C |

- A rare unfortunate ordering, where both transactions wait, and make no progress

| T1: S(a),R(a), X(b),... | T2: S(b),R(b), X(a),... |

- Soln: DBMS monitors how long a transaction has been waiting and aborts it, thus freeing its locks
Deadlocks

- Transactions request exclusive access to a common locked record. T1: $b = f(b, a)$, T2: $a = g(a, b)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1: S(a), R(a), X(b), R(b), W(b), C</th>
<th>T2: S(b),... R(b), X(a), R(a), W(a), C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- A rare unfortunate ordering, where both transactions wait, and make no progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1: S(a), R(a), X(b),...</th>
<th>Abort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2: S(b), R(b),... X(a),...</td>
<td>X(a), R(a), W(a), C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Soln: DBMS monitors how long a transaction has been waiting and aborts it, thus freeing its locks
Abort a Transaction

- If a transaction $Ti$ is aborted, all its actions have to be undone. Not only that, if $Tj$ reads an object last written by $Ti$, $Tj$ must be aborted as well!

- Releasing transaction locks only on commit/abort avoids *cascading aborts* (abort handling is simplified)
  - If $Ti$ writes an object, $Tj$ can read it only after $Ti$ frees lock.

- In order to *undo* the actions of an aborted transaction, the DBMS maintains a *log* in which every write is recorded. This mechanism is also used to recover from system crashes: all active Xacts at the time of the crash are aborted when the system comes back up.
Transactions in SQL

- Transactions begin on any statement that references a table (CREATE, UPDATE, SELECT, INSERT, etc.)
- Transactions end when either a "COMMIT" or "ROLLBACK" (Abort) command is reached
- SQL provides a "SAVEPOINT name" to break up transactions into intermediate pieces, which can be gotten back to using "ROLLBACK TO SAVEPOINT name"
- Operations between 2 savepoints are handled as separate Xactions, in terms of concurrency control
The Log

- The following actions are recorded in the log:
  - *Ti writes an object*: the *old value* and the *new value*.
  - *Ti commits/aborts*: a log record indicating this action.

- Log records are chained together by Xact id, so it’s easy to undo a specific Xact.

- All log related activities (and in fact, all concurrency-control related activities such as lock/unlock, dealing with deadlocks etc.) are handled transparently by the DBMS.

- Complication: committed writes might be held in the buffer pool
Recovering From a Crash

- There are 3 phases in the Aries recovery algorithm:
  - **Analysis**: Scan the log forward (from the most recent checkpoint) to identify all Xacts that were in progress, and all dirty pages in the buffer pool at crash time
  - **Redo**: Redoes all updates to dirty pages in the buffer pool, as needed, to ensure that all logged updates are in fact carried out and written to disk.
  - **Undo**: The writes of all Xacts that were in progress at crash time are undone (by restoring the old value of the data, which is in the log record for the update), working backwards in the log. (Some care must be taken to handle the case of a crash occurring during the recovery process!)
Summary

- Concurrency control and recovery are among the most important functions provided by a DBMS.
- Users need not worry about concurrency.
  - System automatically inserts lock/unlock requests and schedules actions of different Xacts in such a way as to ensure that the resulting execution is equivalent to executing the Xacts one after the other in some order.
- Write-ahead logging (WAL) is used to undo the actions of aborted transactions and to restore the system to a consistent state after a crash.
  - **Consistent state**: Only the effects of committed Xacts seen.