

IF5014 – Kontrol Transaksi Konkuren

Wikan Danar

Departemen Teknik Informatika

Institut Teknologi Bandung

Concurrency Control Algorithms

- Pessimistic
 - Two-Phase Locking-based (2PL)
 - Centralized (primary site) 2PL
 - Primary copy 2PL
 - Distributed 2PL
 - Timestamp Ordering (TO)
 - Basic TO
 - Multiversion TO
 - Conservative TO
 - Hybrid
- Optimistic
 - Locking-based
 - Timestamp ordering-based

Locking-Based Algorithms


- Transactions indicate their intentions by requesting locks from the scheduler (called **lock manager**).
- Locks are either **read lock** (*rl*) [also called **shared lock**] or **write lock** (*wl*) [also called **exclusive lock**]
- Read locks and write locks conflict (because Read and Write operations are incompatible)

	<i>rl</i>	<i>wl</i>
<i>rl</i>	yes	no
<i>wl</i>	no	no

- Locking works nicely to allow concurrent processing of transactions.


Two-Phase Locking (2PL)

- 1 A Transaction locks an object before using it.
- 2 When an object is locked by another transaction, the requesting transaction must wait.
- 3 When a transaction releases a lock, it may not request another lock.




Strict 2PL

Hold locks until the end.



Centralized 2 PL

- There is only one 2PL scheduler in the distributed system.
- Lock requests are issued to the central scheduler.



Distributed 2PL


- 2PL schedulers are placed at each site. Each scheduler handles lock requests for data at that site.
- A transaction may read any of the replicated copies of item x , by obtaining a read lock on one of the copies of x . Writing into x requires obtaining write locks for all copies of x .

Distributed 2PL Execution

Coordinating TM

Participating LMs

Participating DPs



Timestamp Ordering

- 1 Transaction (T_i) is assigned a globally unique timestamp $ts(T_i)$.
- 2 Transaction manager attaches the timestamp to all operations issued by the transaction.
- 3 Each data item is assigned a write timestamp (wts) and a read timestamp (rts):
 - ▣ $rts(x)$ = largest timestamp of any read on x
 - ▣ $wts(x)$ = largest timestamp of any read on x
- 4 Conflicting operations are resolved by timestamp order.

Basic T/O:

for $R_i(x)$

if $ts(T_i) < wts(x)$

then reject $R_i(x)$

else accept $R_i(x)$

$rts(x) \leftarrow ts(T_i)$

for $W_i(x)$

if $ts(T_i) < rts(x)$ and $ts(T_i) < wts(x)$

then reject $W_i(x)$

else accept $W_i(x)$

$wts(x) \leftarrow ts(T_i)$

Conservative Timestamp Ordering


- Basic timestamp ordering tries to execute an operation as soon as it receives it
 - progressive
 - too many restarts since there is no delaying
- Conservative timestamping delays each operation until there is an assurance that it will not be restarted
- Assurance?
 - No other operation with a smaller timestamp can arrive at the scheduler
 - Note that the delay may result in the formation of deadlocks

Multiversion Timestamp Ordering


- Do not modify the values in the database, create new values.
- A $R_i(x)$ is translated into a read on one version of x .
 - Find a version of x (say x_v) such that $ts(x_v)$ is the largest timestamp less than $ts(T_i)$.
- A $W_i(x)$ is translated into $W_i(x_w)$ and accepted if the scheduler has not yet processed any $R_j(x_r)$ such that
$$ts(T_i) < ts(x_r) < ts(T_j)$$

Optimistic Concurrency Control Algorithms

Pessimistic execution



Optimistic execution




Optimistic Concurrency Control Algorithms

- Transaction execution model: divide into subtransactions each of which execute at a site
 - T_{ij} : transaction T_i that executes at site j
- Transactions run independently at each site until they reach the end of their read phases
- All subtransactions are assigned a timestamp at the end of their read phase
- **Validation test** performed during validation phase. If one fails, all rejected.

Optimistic CC Validation Test


- 1 If all transactions T_k where $ts(T_k) < ts(T_{ij})$ have completed their write phase before T_{ij} has started its read phase, then validation



Optimistic CC Validation Test


- ② If there is any transaction T_k such that $ts(T_k) < ts(T_{ij})$ and which completes its write phase while T_{ij} is in its read phase, then validation succeeds if $WS(T_k) \cap RS(T_{ij}) = \emptyset$

⇒ Read and write phases overlap, but T_{ij} does not read data items written by T_k



Optimistic CC Validation Test

- ③ If there is any transaction T_k such that $ts(T_k) < ts(T_{ij})$ and which completes its read phase before T_{ij} completes its read phase, then validation succeeds if $WS(T_k) \cap RS(T_{ij}) = \emptyset$ and $WS(T_k) \cap WS(T_{ij}) = \emptyset$
- They overlap, but don't access any common data items.



Deadlock

- A transaction is deadlocked if it is blocked and will remain blocked until there is intervention.
- Locking-based CC algorithms may cause deadlocks.
- TO-based algorithms that involve waiting may cause deadlocks.
- Wait-for graph
 - ➡ If transaction T_i waits for another transaction T_j to release a lock on an entity, then $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ in WFG.



Local versus Global WFG

Assume T_1 and T_2 run at site 1, T_3 and T_4 run at site 2. Also assume T_3 waits for a lock held by T_4 which waits for a lock held by T_1 which waits for a lock held by T_2 which, in turn, waits for a lock held by T_3 .

Local WFG



Global WFG



Deadlock Management

- Ignore
 - Let the application programmer deal with it, or restart the system
- Prevention
 - Guaranteeing that deadlocks can never occur in the first place. Check transaction when it is initiated. Requires no run time support.
- Avoidance
 - Detecting potential deadlocks in advance and taking action to insure that deadlock will not occur. Requires run time support.
- Detection and Recovery
 - Allowing deadlocks to form and then finding and breaking them. As in the avoidance scheme, this requires run time support.

Deadlock Prevention

- All resources which may be needed by a transaction must be predeclared.
 - The system must guarantee that none of the resources will be needed by an ongoing transaction.
 - Resources must only be reserved, but not necessarily allocated a priori
 - Unsuitability of the scheme in database environment
 - Suitable for systems that have no provisions for undoing processes.
- Evaluation:
 - Reduced concurrency due to preallocation
 - Evaluating whether an allocation is safe leads to added overhead.
 - Difficult to determine (partial order)
 - + No transaction rollback or restart is involved.

Deadlock Avoidance

- Transactions are not required to request resources a priori.
- Transactions are allowed to proceed unless a requested resource is unavailable.
- In case of conflict, transactions may be allowed to wait for a fixed time interval.
- Order either the data items or the sites and always request locks in that order.
- More attractive than prevention in a database environment.

Deadlock Avoidance – Wait-Die & Wound-Wait Algorithms

- **WAIT-DIE Rule:** If T_i requests a lock on a data item which is already locked by T_j , then T_i is permitted to wait iff $ts(T_i) < ts(T_j)$. If $ts(T_i) > ts(T_j)$, then T_i is aborted and restarted with the same timestamp.
 - if $ts(T_i) < ts(T_j)$ then T_i waits else T_i dies
 - non-preemptive: T_i never preempts T_j
 - prefers younger transactions
- **WOUND-WAIT Rule:** If T_i requests a lock on a data item which is already locked by T_j , then T_i is permitted to wait iff $ts(T_i) > ts(T_j)$. If $ts(T_i) < ts(T_j)$, then T_j is aborted and the lock is granted to T_i .
 - if $ts(T_i) < ts(T_j)$ then T_j is wounded else T_i waits
 - preemptive: T_i preempts T_j if it is younger
 - prefers older transactions

Deadlock Detection


- Transactions are allowed to wait freely.
- Wait-for graphs and cycles.
- Topologies for deadlock detection algorithms
 - Centralized
 - Distributed
 - Hierarchical

Centralized Deadlock Detection

- One site is designated as the deadlock detector for the system. Each scheduler periodically sends its local WFG to the central site which merges them to a global WFG to determine cycles.
- How often to transmit?
 - Too often higher communication cost but lower delays due to undetected deadlocks
 - Too late higher delays due to deadlocks, but lower communication cost
- Would be a reasonable choice if the concurrency control algorithm is also centralized.
- Proposed for Distributed INGRES

Hierarchical Deadlock Detection

Build a hierarchy of detectors



Distributed Deadlock Detection

- Sites cooperate in detection of deadlocks.
- One example:
 - The local WFGs are formed at each site and passed on to other sites. Each local WFG is modified as follows:
 1. Since each site receives the potential deadlock cycles from other sites, these edges are added to the local WFGs
 2. The edges in the local WFG which show that local transactions are waiting for transactions at other sites are joined with edges in the local WFGs which show that remote transactions are waiting for local ones.
 - Each local deadlock detector:
 - looks for a cycle that does not involve the external edge. If it exists, there is a local deadlock which can be handled locally.
 - looks for a cycle involving the external edge. If it exists, it indicates a **potential** global deadlock. Pass on the information to the next site.