Lock-based Concurrency Control

• **Strict Two-phase Locking (Strict 2PL) Protocol:**
  – Each Xact must obtain a *S (shared)* lock on object before reading, and an *X (exclusive)* lock on object before writing.
  – All locks held by a transaction are released when the transaction completes
    • (Non-strict) 2PL Variant: Release locks anytime, but cannot acquire locks after releasing any lock.
  – If an Xact holds an X lock on an object, no other Xact can get a lock (S or X) on that object.

• **Strict 2PL allows only serializable schedules.**
  – Additionally, it simplifies transaction aborts
  – (Non-strict) 2PL also allows only serializable schedules, but involves more complex abort processing
Example (Strict 2PL)

• Consider the dirty read schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A = A + 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = B - 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A = 20       |
| A = 120      |
| Dirty read on A! |
| A = 127.2    |

With Strict 2PL, T2 can only access A when T1 aborts
Example (Non-Strict 2PL)

- Consider the dirty read schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A=A+100</td>
<td>A=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A=1.06*A</td>
<td>A=120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit</td>
<td>Dirty read on A!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B=B-100</td>
<td>A=127.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With non-strict 2PL, T2 can still read uncommitted data if T1 aborts!
Deadlocks

• Cycle of transactions waiting for locks to be released
• DBMS has to either prevent or resolve deadlocks
• Common approach:
  – Detect via timeout
  – Resolve by aborting transactions
Aborting a Transaction

• If a transaction $T_1$ is aborted, all its actions have to be undone.
  – Not only that, if $T_2$ reads an object last written by $T_1$, $T_2$ must be aborted as well!

• Most systems avoid such cascading aborts by releasing a transaction’s locks only at commit time.
  – If $T_1$ writes an object, $T_2$ can read this only after $T_1$ commits.

• 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
Lock Granularity

- What should the DBMS lock?
  - Row?
  - Page?
  - A Table?
Crash Recovery

• **Transaction Manager**: DBMS component that controls execution (e.g. managing locks).

• **Recovery Manager**: DBMS component for ensuring
  – **Atomicity**: undo actions of transactions that do not commit
  – **Durability**: committed transactions survive system crashed and media failures

• **Assume atomic writes to disk.**
The Log

• The following actions are recorded in the log:
  – *Ti writes an object:* the old value and the new value.
    • Log record must go to disk *before* the changed page! (Write Ahead Log property)
  – *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.

• Log is often *duplexed and archived* on stable storage.

• All log related activities (and in fact, all CC related activities such as lock/unlock, dealing with deadlocks etc.) are handled transparently by the DBMS.
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 active, and all dirty pages in the buffer pool at the time of the crash.
  - **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 active at the crash are undone (by restoring the *before value* of the update, 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!)