Concurrency Control in Distributed Databases

In distributed DB

T1
X

T2
Y
Z
In centralized (Local) DB

T1  T2  …  Tn

DB
(consistency constraints)

Example:

T1:   T2:  
Read(A) Read(A)  
A ← A+100 A ← A×2  
Write(A) Write(A)  
Read(B) Read(B)  
B ← B+100 B ← B×2  
Write(B) Write(B)  

Constraint: A=B
### Schedule A: Serial Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read(A); A ← A+100</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(B); B ← B+100;</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(A); A ← A×2;</td>
<td>Read(A); A ← A×2;</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(B); B ← B×2;</td>
<td>Read(B); B ← B×2;</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Schedule B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read(A); A ← A+100</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(B); B ← B+100;</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(A); A ← A×2;</td>
<td>Read(A); A ← A×2;</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(B); B ← B×2;</td>
<td>Read(B); B ← B×2;</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |                     | 250| 250|
### Schedule C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read(A); A ← A+100</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(A); A ← A×2;</td>
<td>Read(B); B ← B×2;</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(B); B ← B+100;</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Same as Schedule C but with new T2’*

### Schedule D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2’</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read(A); A ← A+100</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(A); A ← A×1;</td>
<td>Read(B); B ← B×1;</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(A);</td>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(B); B ← B+100;</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(B);</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**What are good schedules?**

- Want schedules that are “good”, regardless of 
  - initial state and
  - transaction semantics
- Only look at order of reads and writes

Example:

\[ S_B = r_1(A)w_1(A)r_2(A)w_2(A)r_1(B)w_1(B)r_2(B)w_2(B) \]

**Example:**

\[ S_B' = r_1(A)w_1(A)w_2(A)r_1(B)w_1(B)r_2(B)w_2(B) \]

No cycles \( \Rightarrow S_B \) is “equivalent” to a serial schedule (in this case \( T_1, T_2 \))
Example (Cont)

\[ Sc = r_1(A)w_1(A)r_2(A)w_2(A) r_2(B)w_2(B)r_1(B)w_1(B) \]

\[ T_1 \to T_2 \]
\[ Also, \ T_2 \to T_1 \]

Sc cannot be rearranged into a serial schedule
Sc is not “equivalent” to any serial schedule
Sc is “bad”
**Concepts**

Transaction: sequence of $r(x)$, $w(x)$ actions

Conflicting actions: $r_1(A)$ $w_1(A)$ $w_1(A)$ $w_2(A)$ $r_2(A)$ $w_2(A)$

Schedule: represents chronological order in which actions are executed

Serial schedule: no interleaving of actions or transactions

Serializable schedule: a schedule whose effect on any consistent database instance is guaranteed to be identical to that of some complete serial schedule

**Definition**

$S_1$, $S_2$ are conflict equivalent schedules if $S_1$ can be transformed into $S_2$ by a series of swaps on non-conflicting actions.

A schedule is conflict serializable if it is conflict equivalent to some serial schedule.
**Precedence graph \( P(S) \) (\( S \) is schedule)**

Nodes: transactions in \( S \)

Arcs: \( T_i \to T_j \) whenever
- \( p_i(A), q_j(A) \) are actions in \( S \)
- \( p_i(A) \prec_S q_j(A) \)
- at least one of \( p_i, q_j \) is a write

---

**Theorem**

\[ P(S_1) \text{ acyclic} \iff S_1 \text{ conflict serializable} \]
Distributed Transactions

- A distributed transaction $T$ is initiated at one site and spawned subtransactions at several other sites. We distinguish the subtransaction at home site by calling it the coordinator, while the other subtransactions are the participants.
Distributed Transactions

$T_1$ in site A, denoted as $T_1^A$, is the coordinator.

$T_1$ in site B, denoted as $T_1^B$, is the participant.

$T_2^B$, is the coordinator. $T_2^A$, is the participant.

$T_1^A$ waits for $T_1^B$, and $T_2^B$ waits for $T_2^A$.

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$(T_1) a \leftarrow X$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>$(T_2) c \leftarrow X$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$(T_1) X \leftarrow a+100$</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>$(T_2) X \leftarrow 2c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$(T_1) b \leftarrow Y$</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>$(T_2) d \leftarrow Y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$(T_1) Y \leftarrow b+100$</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>$(T_2) Y \leftarrow 2d$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Node 1: $X$ in site A Node 2: $Y$ in site A

constraint: $X=Y$

↓ Precedence relation
Schedule S1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(node X)</th>
<th></th>
<th>(node Y)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (T₁)</td>
<td>a←X</td>
<td>3 (T₁)</td>
<td>b←Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (T₁)</td>
<td>X←a+100</td>
<td>4 (T₁)</td>
<td>Y←b+100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (T₂)</td>
<td>c←X</td>
<td>7 (T₂)</td>
<td>d←Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (T₂)</td>
<td>X←2c</td>
<td>8 (T₂)</td>
<td>Y←2d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If X=Y=0 initially, X=Y=200 at end (always good?)

Serializability in Distributed DBMS

- Somewhat more involved. Two types of schedules have to be considered:
  - local schedules
  - global schedule

- For global transactions (i.e., global schedule) to be serializable, two conditions are necessary:
  - Each local schedule should be serializable.
  - All sub-transactions of global transactions appear in the same order in the equivalent serial schedule at ALL sites.
Global Non-serializability

Consider 2 sites and one data item x that is duplicated in both sites

\[ T_1: \] Read(x) \\
\[ x \leftarrow x+5 \] \\
\[ \text{Write}(x) \] \\
\[ \text{Commit} \]

\[ T_2: \] Read(x) \\
\[ x \leftarrow x \times 10 \] \\
\[ \text{Write}(x) \] \\
\[ \text{Commit} \]

The following two local schedules are individually serializable (in fact serial), but the two transactions are not globally serializable.

\[ LH_1=\{R_1(x), W_1(x), R_2(x), W_2(x)\} \quad T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \]

\[ LH_2=\{R_2(x), W_2(x), R_1(x), W_1(x)\} \quad T_2 \rightarrow T_1 \]

Assume x=1 initially. At site 1, x=60 after LH1. At site 2, x=15 after LH2. Violates the mutual consistency.

Global Non-serializability (Cont)

\[ LH_1=\{R_1(x), W_1(x), R_2(x), W_2(x)\} \]

\[ LH_2=\{R_2(x), W_2(x), R_1(x), W_1(x)\} \]

Assume x=1 initially. At site 1, x=60 after LH1. At site 2, x=15 after LH2. Violates the mutual consistency.
How to enforce serializable schedules?

prevent P(S) cycles from occurring

$T_1 \ T_2 \ \ldots \ \ldots \ T_n$

Scheduler

DB

Classification of Concurrency control Mechanisms

Concurrency control algorithms

Pessimistic

Locking

Centralised

Primary copy

Distributed

Timestamp ordering

Hybrid

Optimistic

Locking

Timestamp ordering

Basic

Multi-version

Conservative
A locking protocol

Two new actions:
lock (exclusive):
unlock:

T1 T2
scheduler

lock
table

Locking Rules in centralized db
(2-phase locking)

- Well-formed transactions
- Legal schedulers
- Two-phase transactions

- These rules guarantee serializable schedules
Rules

Rule #1: Well-formed transactions
Ti: … li(A) … pi(A) … ui(A) …

Rule #2: Legal scheduler
S = ……… li(A) …………… ui(A) ………

no lj(A)

Exercise:

• What schedules are legal?
What transactions are well-formed?
S1 = l1(A)l1(B)r1(A)w1(B)l2(B)u1(A)u1(B)
r2(B)w2(B)u2(B)l3(B)r3(B)u3(B)
S2 = l1(A)r1(A)w1(B)u1(A)u1(B)
l2(B)r2(B)w2(B)l3(B)r3(B)u3(B)
S3 = l1(A)r1(A)u1(A)l1(B)w1(B)u1(B)
l2(B)r2(B)w2(B)u2(B)l3(B)r3(B)u3(B)
Exercise:

• **What schedules are legal?**
  What transactions are well-formed?

S1 = \(l_1(A)l_1(B)r_1(A)w_1(B)l_2(B)u_1(A)u_1(B)\)

\(r_2(B)w_2(B)u_2(B)l_3(B)r_3(B)u_3(B)\)

S2 = \(l_1(A)r_1(A)w_1(B)u_1(A)u_1(B)\)

\(l_2(B)r_2(B)w_2(B)l_3(B)r_3(B)u_3(B)\)

S3 = \(l_1(A)r_1(A)u_1(A)l_1(B)w_1(B)u_1(B)\)

\(l_2(B)r_2(B)w_2(B)u_2(B)l_3(B)r_3(B)u_3(B)\)

---

**Schedule F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>1. (l_1(A);\text{Read}(A))</td>
<td>2. (l_2(A);\text{Read}(A))</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. (A \leftarrow A+100;\text{Write}(A);u_1(A))</td>
<td>4. (A \leftarrow A\times2;\text{Write}(A);u_2(A))</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. (l_2(B);\text{Read}(B))</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. (B \leftarrow B\times2;\text{Write}(B);u_2(B))</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>1. (l_1(B);\text{Read}(B))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. (B \leftarrow B+100;\text{Write}(B);u_1(B))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

CS5225 Concurrency Control
Two phase locking (2PL) for transactions

# locks held by Ti

Growing Phase

Shrinking Phase

Time

Schedule G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l_1(A); Read(A)</td>
<td>l_2(A); Read(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ← A+100; Write(A)</td>
<td>A ← A_2x; Write(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l_1(B); u_1(A)</td>
<td>delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read(B); B ← B+100</td>
<td>l_2(B); u_2(A); Read(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write(B); u_1(B)</td>
<td>B ← B_2x; Write(B); u_2(B);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Schedule H (T2 reversed)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>l1(A); Read(A)</code></td>
<td><code>l1(B); Read(B)</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>A ← A+100; Write(A)</code></td>
<td><code>B ← Bx2; Write(B)</code></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Delayed* transactions are rolled back

**Theorem**

2PL $\Rightarrow$ conflict serializable schedule
Strict 2PL

Locking-Based Algorithms

- That's all that is needed to ensure serializability!
- Beyond this is to improve concurrency
  - Locks are either read lock (also called *shared lock*) or write lock (also called *exclusive lock*)
  - Read locks and write locks are *conflicting* (or incompatible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rlock</th>
<th>wlock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rlock</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wlock</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Locking in distributed DB

• Just like in a centralized system
• But with multiple lock managers

Distributed Locking

• Look at three schemes:
  – Centralized locking
  – Primary Copy 2PL
  – Distributed 2PL
Centralized Locking

- Single site that maintains all locking information.
- One lock manager for whole of DDBMS.
- Local transaction managers involved in global transaction request and release locks from lock manager.
- Or transaction coordinator can make all locking requests on behalf of local transaction managers.

Communication Structure of Centralised 2PL

Data processors at participating sites → Coordinating TM → Central site LM

1. lock request → 2. lock granted
3. operation
4. end of operation → 5. release lock
Primary Copy 2PL

- Lock managers distributed to a number of sites.
- Each lock manager responsible for managing locks for set of data items.
- For replicated data item, one copy is chosen as primary copy, others are slave copies.
- Only need to write-lock primary copy of data item that is to be updated.
- Once primary copy has been updated, change can be propagated to slaves.

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 \( x \).
Dealing with Multiple Copies of Data

Three schemes which guarantee that conflicts are discovered at least in one site.

1. **Read-lock-one, write-lock-all (ROWA).** To read a data item A, a transaction may obtain a read-lock on any copy of A. To write on a data item A, a transaction must obtain write-locks on all copies of A.
Dealing with Multiple Copies of Data

2. The majority locking strategy. To read a data item A, a transaction may obtain read-locks on a majority of the copies of A. To write on a data item A, a transaction must also obtain write-locks on a majority of the copies of A.

3. Primary Copy Locking. All locks for a data item A are requested at the site of the primary copy.

Deadlock and Wait for Graph

- A transaction is deadlocked if it is blocked and will remain blocked until there is intervention.
- Locking-based CC algorithms may cause deadlocks.
- Wait-for graph (WFG).

\[ T_i \rightsquigarrow T_j \]

\[ T_j \rightsquigarrow T_i \]
Local versus Global WFG

- Transaction T1 is initiated at site A and spawned subtransactions at site B. Transaction T2 is initiated at site B and spawned subtransactions at site A.

- Assume T1 waits for a lock held by T2 at site B, and T2 waits for a lock held by T1 at site A.

Site A (no cycle locally)  Site B (No cycle)

Local versus Global WFG

- Transaction T1 is initiated at site A and spawned subtransactions at site B. Transaction T2 is initiated at site B and spawned subtransactions at site A.

- Assume T1 waits for a lock held by T2 at site B, and T2 waits for a lock held by T1 at site A.

Site A  Site B
Deadlock Management

- Ignore
  - use `timeout`.
- Avoidance
  - detecting potential deadlocks in advance and taking action to ensure that deadlock will not occur.
- Detection and Recovery
  - Allowing deadlocks to form and then finding and breaking them.

Deadlock Detection

- Topologies for deadlock detection algorithms
  - Centralized
  - Hierarchical
  - Distributed
Centralized Deadlock Detection

- Single site appointed deadlock detection coordinator (DDC).
- Each scheduler periodically sends its local WFG to the central site.
- DDC has responsibility of constructing and maintaining GWFG.
- If one or more cycles exist, DDC must break each cycle by selecting transactions to be rolled back and restarted.

Hierarchical Deadlock Detection

- Sites are organized into a hierarchy.
- Each site sends its LWFG to detection site above it in hierarchy.
- Reduces dependence on centralized detection site.
Hierarchical Deadlock Detection

Distributed Deadlock Detection

- Sites cooperate in detection of deadlocks.
  - The local WFGs are formed at each site and passed on to other sites.
  - The WFGs are combined into a GWFGs.
  - To save cost, only when a potential deadlock exists then will the WFG be transmitted.
Local versus Global WFG

- There is a potential global deadlock found in site A, because the WFG in site A has a cycle involving the external node EX.
- Similarly, it is true for site B.

Distributed Deadlock Detection

All potential global deadlock graphs discovered at site i are forwarded to the site j where there is a transaction T for which site i is waiting.
Distributed Deadlock Detection

T2 ← T1 ← T4

T2 ← T3 ← T4

T3 ← T2 ← T1 ← T4
Q: How to avoid the same deadlock being detected more than once?
Example

• r6(l), r2(y), r5(m), r1(z), r1(x), r4(b), r3(a), r6(n), r3(c), r5(a), r1(y), r3(x), r6(m), r2(b), r4(n)

Site A Site B Site C

Example

• r6(l), r2(y), r5(m), r1(z), r1(x), r4(b), r3(a), r6(n), r3(c), r5(a), r1(y), r3(x), r6(m), r2(b), r4(n)

Site A Site B Site C
Example

- r6(l), r2(y), r5(m), r1(z), r1(x), r4(b), r3(a), r6(n), r3(c), r5(a), r1(y), r3(x), r6(m), r2(b), r4(n)

```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site A</th>
<th>Site B</th>
<th>Site C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x (T1)</td>
<td>a (T3)</td>
<td>I (T6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y (T2)</td>
<td>b (T4)</td>
<td>m (T5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z (T1)</td>
<td>c (T3)</td>
<td>n (T6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Site A Site B Site C

Example

- r6(l), r2(y), r5(m), r1(z), r1(x), r4(b), r3(a), r6(n), r3(c), r5(a), r1(y), r3(x), r6(m), r2(b), r4(n)

```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site A</th>
<th>Site B</th>
<th>Site C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x (T1)</td>
<td>a (T3)</td>
<td>I (T6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y (T2)</td>
<td>b (T4)</td>
<td>m (T5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z (T1)</td>
<td>c (T3)</td>
<td>n (T6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Site A Site B Site C
Size of Data Items

The *size* or *granularity* of the data item that can be locked in a single operation has effect on the performance of the concurrency control method.

*Granule size* can be:
- Tuple –
- Page (or bucket) –
- Relation –

Size of Data Items (Cont)

*Consider a transaction which is simply updating a tuple of a relation:*

  - Tuple – the CC locks only that tuple
  - Relation – the CC locks the whole relation

*Consider a transaction which is updating many tuples of a relation:*

  - Tuple – the CC locks each individual tuple separately
  - Relation – the CC locks the entire relation
Size of Data Items (Cont)

Ideally, the CC should support mixed granularity with tuple, page and relation level locking.

DBMS will automatically upgrade locks from tuple to page to relation if a particular transaction is locking more than a certain percentage of the tuples or pages in the relation.

Summary

- Data sharing has to be managed to present inconsistencies or other anomalies
- Locking is the most widely used mechanism
- Deadlock has to be managed