More Dynamic Databases

- If the set of DB objects changes, Strict 2PL using row or page locks will not ensure serializability (locking whole tables will work but is horribly slow)

- Example:
  - T1 finds oldest sailor for each of rating=1 and rating=2
  - T2 does an insertion and a deletion
    1. T1 locks all pages with `rating = 1`, finds oldest sailor (`age = 71`)
    2. Next, T2 inserts a new sailor; `rating = 1`, `age = 96`
    3. T2 deletes oldest sailor with rating = 2 (`age = 80`), commits
    4. T1 locks all pages with `rating = 2`, and finds oldest (`age = 63`)

- No serial schedule gives same outcome!
The “Phantom” Problem

- T1 implicitly assumes that it has locked the set of all sailor records with \textit{rating} = 1
  - Assumption only holds if no sailor records are added while T1 is executing!

- Two mechanisms to address the problem
  - Index locking
  - Predicate locking
Another phantom example

- Table tasks has one row for each worker task, with worker name, task name, number of hours
- Rule that no worker has more than 8 hours total
- Application A to add a task sums hours for worker, adds task if it fits under 8 hours max
  - T1 running A sees ‘Joe’ has 6 hours, adds task of 2 hours
  - Concurrently, T2 running A sees ‘Joe’ has 6 hours, adds task of 1 hour.
- Joe ends up with 9 hours of work.
- Again, the problem is there is no lock on the set of rows being examined to make a decision
Index Locking

- Assume index on the *rating* field
- T1 should lock the index page(s) containing the data entries with *rating* = 1, and their immediate neighbors
  - If there are no records with *rating* = 1, T1 must lock the index page where such a data entry *would* be, if it existed!
  - e.g., lock the page with rating = 0 and beginning of rating=2
  - Or lock pages for just one extra data item on one side, if a lock is understood to cover the key value plus gap to one side.
- If there is no suitable index, T1 must lock all data pages, and lock the file to prevent new pages from being added
Index Locking

- Assume index on the `rating` field
- Row locking is the industry standard now
- T1 should lock all the data entries with `rating = 1` and at least one neighbor (depending on details of protocol)
  - If there are no records with `rating = 1`, T1 must lock the entries adjacent to where data entry would be, if it existed!
  - e.g., lock the last entry with rating = 0 and beginning of rating=2
- If there is no suitable index, T1 must lock all the rows and lock the file to prevent new rows from being added, or use a “table lock”.
Predicate Locking

- Grant lock on all records that satisfy some logical predicate
  - But note that a general predicate can depend on data in the row: salary > 50000 + 1000*years
  - Or a whole table: salary > (select avg(salary) in emps)

- Index locking is a special case of predicate locking
  - Index supports efficient implementation of the predicate lock
  - Predicate is specified in WHERE clause

- In general, predicate locking is expensive to implement!
  - Can avoid the runtime cost by using Repeatable Read isolation level, but that opens up anomaly possibilities.
Index Locking, Blow by blow

- Index locking happens in the storage engine, based on FILE calls coming from query processor as directed by the query plan.

- Example: Transaction T1 accesses a heap table with certain index, gets row for certain index key value, say 100. Suppose the next data entry is for another key, 102.
  - Storage engine share-locks the accessed data entry for key 100, guarding it and the gap between that key and the next key.
  - Then if another transaction T2 tries to change the row with key 100, can’t get necessary X lock, waits. Same with key 101.
  - Original transaction T1 can ask for next key, get 102.
  - But if another transaction updates row with key 102 (not guarded by T1’s share lock), then then T1 has to wait for the next key.
Index Locking Scenario, cont.

- There is an underlying assumption in that story: that all the accesses in fact use the index on this column.
- Well, the important thing is that all accesses that change the column value go through the index. It’s OK for another reader to access the value.
- An insert or delete need to change the index, so they are naturally involved.
- An update to this column also needs to change the index, in two places, so it also collides with the old lock.
- You can see this has to be checked out carefully!
Locking for B+ Trees

- Naïve solution
  - Ignore tree structure, just lock its pages following 2PL

- Very poor performance!
  - Root node (and many higher level nodes) become bottlenecks
  - Every tree access begins at the root!

- Not needed anyway!
  - Only row data needs 2PL (contents of tree)
  - Tree structure also needs protection from concurrent access
  - But only like other shared data of the server program
  - Note this modern view is not covered in book
  - See Graefe, A Survey of B-tree locking techniques (2010)
  - B-tree locking is a huge challenge!
Locking vs. Latching

- To protect shared data in memory, multithreaded programs use mutex (semaphores)
  - API: enter_section/leave_section, or lock/unlock
  - Every Java object contains a mutex, for convenience of Java programming: underlies synchronized methods
  - Database people call mutexes and related mechanisms “latches”
  - Need background in multi-threaded programming to understand this topic fully

- The tree structure needs mutex/latch protection
- Example: split node. No row data is changed, just the details in pages in the buffer pool. No i/o is needed (can’t hold a latch across disk i/o without ruining performance.)
- Latches can be provided by the same lock manager as does 2PL locking, and can have share and exclusive types like locks.
- In these slides, will use “lock” in quotes to mean non-2PL lock/latch…
Locking for B+ Trees (contd.)

- **Searches**
  - Higher levels only direct searches for leaf pages

- **Insertions**
  - Node on a path from root to modified leaf must be “locked” in X mode only if a split can propagate up to it
  - Similar point holds for deletions

- There are efficient locking protocols that keep the B-tree healthy under concurrent access, and support 2PL on rows
A Simple Tree Locking Algorithm:
(“lock” here is really a latch on tree structure)

- **Search**
  - Start at root and descend: “crabbing down the tree”
  - repeatedly, get S “lock” for child then “unlock” parent, end up with S “lock” on leaf page
  - Get 2PL S lock on row, provide row pointer to caller
  - Later, caller is done with reading row, arranges release of S “lock”

- **Insert/Delete**
  - Start at root and descend, crabbing, obtaining X “locks” as needed
  - Once child is “locked”, check if it is **safe**
  - If child is safe, release “lock” on parent, leaving X “lock” on child
  - Get 2PL X lock on place for new row/old row, insert/delete row, release “lock”

- **Safe node**: not about to split or coalesce
  - Inserts: Node is not full
  - Deletes: Node is not half-empty

- When control gets back to QP, transaction only has 2PL locks on rows
The algorithm actions described in the text are valid, for example, crabbing down the tree, worrying about full nodes, etc.

What’s different is that the locks for index nodes are shorter lived than described in the text: only 2PL locks on rows are kept until end of transaction, not any locks on index nodes.

Note that text uses locks and releases them before commit, a sign that they are not actually Strict 2PL locks.

Note the admission on pg. 564 that the text’s coverage on this topic is “not state of the art”. Graefe’s paper is.
An Example

Do:
- Search 38*
- Insert 45*
- Insert 25*
- Delete 38*

20 35

20* 22*

23* 24*

35* 36*

38* 41*

44*
Insert 45 case

Crab down tree getting X “locks” (really latches)
“Xlock” A
“Xlock” B
B is safe, so “unXlock” A
“Xlock” C
C is unsafe, so can’t “unXlock” B now
“Xlock” E (page of rows)
E is safe, so “unXLock” C
Xlock row (2PL lock) for 45, copy out row or pin buffer, provide row pointer to caller
“UnXLock” E
Return to QP with 2PL X lock on row with key 45 (or index entry and row)
A Variation on Algorithms

- **Search**
  - As before

- **Insert/Delete**
  - Set “locks” as if for search, get to leaf, and set 2PL X lock on leaf
  - If leaf is not safe, release all “locks”, and restart using previous Insert/Delete protocol

- This is what happens if the search down the tree happens on a page that is not in buffer—don’t want to hold a latch across a disk i/o (takes too long)
Lock Management

- Lock and unlock requests are handled by the lock manager (see Sec. 17.2.1)

- Lock table entry:
  - Lock name/identifier
  - Number of transactions currently holding a lock
  - Type of lock held (shared or exclusive)
  - Pointer to queue of lock requests

- Locking and unlocking have to be atomic operations (need mutex protection)

- Lock table entries are kept in order, to prevent starvation (lots of reads preventing a writer from ever getting a lock, etc.)
Lock Manager Data structure: a multilist

- Need access to lock entry by lock name or transaction id
- Some of these transactions are blocked on the lock
Multiple-Granularity Locks

- Hard to decide what granularity to lock
  - tuples vs. pages vs. files
  - Inefficient to have a million row locks to scan a relation
- Shouldn’t have to decide once and for all!
- Data containers are nested:
New Lock Modes, Protocol

- Allow transactions to lock at each level, but with a special protocol using new **intention locks**

- Before locking an item, must set intention locks on ancestors

- To lock an item with an S lock (X lock), need an IS (IX) lock or stronger on ancestors

- For unlock, go from specific to general (i.e., bottom-up).

- **SIX mode:** Like S & IX at the same time.

```
+---+---+---+---+---+
|   | IS | IX | S  | X  |
|---+---+---+---+---|
| --| √  | √  | √  | √  |
| IS| √  | √  | √  | √  |
| IX| √  | √  |   |   |
| S | √  |   |   | √  |
| X | √  |   |   |   |
```
New Lock Modes, Protocol

- Lock manager doesn’t care: just make up lock names with table name or item id, use new lock compatibility table
- Protocol makes client check higher level(s) first, then target level, so lock manager itself (or its kernel part) has no responsibility to know relationship between locks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>--</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>