Olaf Hartig olaf.hartig@liu.se



### **ACID Properties**





- Consider a transaction with several update operations where one of them violates an integrity constraint; the other ones are correct
- A DBMS might do the following:
  - return an error message for the incorrect operation,
  - successfully execute the other operations (which is possible because they are all correct), and
  - commit the transaction
- By doing so, the system fails to guarantee the ACID properties!
- Which property in particular would be violated in this case?
  - 1. Atomicity

- 3. Isolation
- 2. **C**onsistency preservation
- 4. **D**urability





- Assume a DBMS that only supports one transaction at a time
  - i.e., if there are multiple transactions, they may simply have to queue up before they are considered by the system
- Which of the ACID properties would be guaranteed *trivially* by this system?



- 1. Atomicity
- 2. Consistency preservation
- 3. Isolation
- 4. Durability



**Basic Concepts** 





- Remember that *schedules* may contain operations from multiple transactions
- How many operations from each transaction can be in one such schedule?

1. only one

- 2. at most 64 if we assume a 64-bit computer architecture
- 3. all of them
- 4. all of them but they must all come directly after one another (i.e., without operations from other transactions in between)





- Which of the following types of schedules is guaranteed to produce a state of the database that is correct? (assuming all transactions in such schedules have the consistency preservation property)
  - 1. serial schedules
  - 2. serializable schedules with operations from only one transaction
  - 3. all serializable schedules
  - 4. all of the above





**Conflict Equivalence** 





- Consider the following schedule
  S<sub>1</sub>: b<sub>1</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>2</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>2</sub>(Y), e<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(Y), r<sub>3</sub>(X), e<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>1</sub>(Y), e<sub>1</sub>
- How many pairs of conflicting operations are in this schedule?
  - 1. only one
  - 2. three
  - 3. four
  - 4. six







- Consider the following two schedules  $S_1$ :  $b_1$ ,  $r_1(X)$ ,  $b_2$ ,  $r_2(Y)$ ,  $w_1(X)$ ,  $b_3$ ,  $w_2(Y)$ ,  $e_2$ ,  $r_1(Y)$ ,  $r_3(X)$ ,  $e_3$ ,  $w_1(Y)$ ,  $e_1$  $S_2$ :  $b_2$ ,  $r_2(Y)$ ,  $b_1$ ,  $r_1(X)$ ,  $w_1(X)$ ,  $b_3$ ,  $w_2(Y)$ ,  $e_2$ ,  $r_3(X)$ ,  $r_1(Y)$ ,  $e_3$ ,  $w_1(Y)$ ,  $e_1$
- Are these two schedules conflict equivalent?
  - 1. yes
  - 2. no
  - 3. that's a trick question because only operations can be conflict equivalent
  - 4. sorry, I don't know





Serializability





- Consider the following schedule
  S<sub>1</sub>: b<sub>1</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>2</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>2</sub>(Y), e<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(Y), r<sub>3</sub>(X), e<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>1</sub>(Y), e<sub>1</sub>
- Is this schedule serializable?
  - 1. yes
  - 2. no







- Consider the following schedule
  S<sub>1</sub>: b<sub>1</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>2</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>2</sub>(Y), e<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(Y), r<sub>3</sub>(X), e<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>1</sub>(Y), e<sub>1</sub>
- Is this schedule serializable?
  - 1. yes
  - 2. <del>-no</del>-







- Consider the following schedule
  S<sub>1</sub>: b<sub>1</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>2</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>2</sub>(Y), e<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(Y), r<sub>3</sub>(X), e<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>1</sub>(Y), e<sub>1</sub>
- Write down a serial schedule that is conflict equivalent with  $S_1$







- Consider the following schedule
  S<sub>1</sub>: b<sub>1</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>2</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>2</sub>(Y), e<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(Y), r<sub>3</sub>(X), e<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>1</sub>(Y), e<sub>1</sub>
- Write down a serial schedule that is conflict equivalent with  $S_1$

 $S_3$ :  $b_2$ ,  $r_2(Y)$ ,  $w_2(Y)$ ,  $e_2$ ,  $b_1$ ,  $r_1(X)$ ,  $w_1(X)$ ,  $r_1(Y)$ ,  $w_1(Y)$ ,  $e_1$ ,  $b_3$ ,  $r_3(X)$ ,  $e_3$ 







- Consider the following schedule (which is a different one now!)
  S<sub>4</sub>: b<sub>1</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(Y), b<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>2</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>2</sub>(Y), e<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>3</sub>(X), e<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>1</sub>(Y), e<sub>1</sub>
- Is this schedule serializable?
  - 1. yes
  - 2. no







- Consider the following schedule
  S<sub>4</sub>: b<sub>1</sub>, r<sub>1</sub>(Y), b<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>2</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(X), b<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>2</sub>(Y), e<sub>2</sub>, r<sub>3</sub>(X), e<sub>3</sub>, w<sub>1</sub>(Y), e<sub>1</sub>
- Is this schedule serializable?

1. <del>-yes-</del>

2. no, because its serialization graph contains a cycle







Locking



# Quiz

- Consider the following situation:
  - transaction TA1 holds exclusive lock on data item D1
  - transaction TA2 holds shared lock on data item D2
  - transaction TA2 is currently waiting for shared lock on D1
- Now, TA1 wants to read data item D2
- Which lock does TA1 need, and will it get this lock immediately?
  - 1. shared lock; can get it immediately
  - 2. shared lock; will have to wait for it
  - 3. exclusive lock; can get it immediately
  - 4. exclusive lock; will have to wait for it



## Quiz

- Consider the following transaction (with lock operations):
  exclLock(X), r<sub>1</sub>(X), w<sub>1</sub>(X), unlock(X), exclLock(Y), r<sub>1</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(Y), unlock(Y)
- Is this transaction valid in terms of the locks that it needs to hold for the operations that it aims to do?
  - 1. yes
  - 2. no, because it needs to obtain shared locks as well
  - 3. no, because it needs to obtain all locks in the beginning
  - 4. no, because of both of the aforementioned reasons



## Quiz

- Consider the following transaction (with lock operations):
  exclLock(X), r<sub>1</sub>(X), w<sub>1</sub>(X), unlock(X), exclLock(Y), r<sub>1</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(Y), unlock(Y)
- Does this TA follow the two-phase locking (2PL) protocol?
  - 1. yes
  - 2. no



#### Exercise

- Consider the following transaction (with lock operations):
  exclLock(X), r<sub>1</sub>(X), w<sub>1</sub>(X), unlock(X), exclLock(Y), r<sub>1</sub>(Y), w<sub>1</sub>(Y), unlock(Y)
- Modify this TA so that it follows 2PL
  - Option 1:

 $exclLock(X), r_1(X), w_1(X), exclLock(Y), unlock(X), r_1(Y), w_1(Y), unlock(Y)$ 

- Option 2:

 $exclLock(X), exclLock(Y), r_1(X), w_1(X), unlock(X), r_1(Y), w_1(Y), unlock(Y)$ 

- Option 3:

 $exclLock(X), r_1(X), exclLock(Y), w_1(X), r_1(Y), unlock(X), w_1(Y), unlock(Y)$ 

- etc.



www.liu.se

