Optimistic Concurrency Control
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Serializability

Executing transactions serially wastes resources

Interleaving transactions creates correctness errors

Give transactions the *illusion* of isolation
Serializability
The Illusion of Isolation

Preserve order of reads, writes across transactions
The Illusion of Isolation

Option 1: Avoid situations that break the illusion
Locking

Lock an object before reading or writing it

Unlock it after the transaction ends

This is pessimistic!
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Locking

• This is expensive! Locking costs are still incurred even if no conflicts ever actually occur!

• This is restrictive! Don’t know in advance what an xact will do, so can’t allow all schedules.
We don’t know what a transaction will do until it does.
So let the transaction do it.

(Then check if it broke anything later)
Optimistic CC

• **Read Phase:** Transaction executes on a private copy of all accessed objects.

• **Validate Phase:** Check for conflicts.

• **Write Phase:** Make the transaction’s changes to updated objects public.
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Read Phase

\textbf{ReadSet}(T_i): \text{Set of objects read by } T_i.

\textbf{WriteSet}(T_i): \text{Set of objects written by } T_i.
Validation Phase

Pick a serial order for the transactions (e.g., assign id #s or timestamps)

When should we assign Transaction IDs? (Why?)
Validation Phase

What tests are needed?
Simple Test

For all $i$ and $k$ for which $i < k$, check that $T_i$ completes before $T_k$ begins.

Is this sufficient?  Is this efficient?
Test 2

For all \( i \) and \( k \) for which \( i < k \), check that \( T_i \) completes before \( T_k \) begins its write phase AND \( \text{WriteSet}(T_i) \cap \text{ReadSet}(T_k) \) is empty

How do these two conditions help?
For all $i$ and $k$ for which $i < k$, check that $T_i$ completes its read phase first AND $\text{WriteSet}(T_i) \cap \text{ReadSet}(T_k)$ is empty AND $\text{WriteSet}(T_i) \cap \text{WriteSet}(T_k)$ is empty.

How do these three conditions help?
Which test (or tests) should we use?

**Hint:** How would you implement each test?
Validation

• Assigning the transaction ID, validation, and the parts of the write phase are a critical section.

• Nothing else can go on concurrently.

• The validation phase can be long; This is bad.

• Optimization: Read-only transactions that don’t need a critical section (no write phase).
Optimistic CC Overheads

• Each operation must be recorded in the readset/writeset (sets are expensive to allocate/destroy)

• Must test for conflicts during validation stage

• Must make validated writes “public”.

  • Critical section reduces concurrency.

  • Can lead to reduced object clustering.

• Optimistic CC must **restart** failed transactions.
Timestamp CC

- Give each object a read timestamp (RTS) and a write timestamp (WTS)

- Give each transaction a timestamp (TS) at the start.

- Use RTS/WTS to track previous operations on the object.

- Compare with TS to ensure ordering is preserved.
• When $T_i$ reads from object $O$:
  
  • If $WTS(O) > TS(T_i)$, $T_i$ is reading from a ‘later’ version.
    
    • Abort $T_i$ and restart with a new timestamp.
  
  • If $WTS(O) < TS(T_i)$, $T_i$’s read is safe.
    
    • Set $RTS(O)$ to $\text{MAX}(RTS(O), TS(T_i))$
When \( T_i \) writes to object \( O \):

- If \( \text{RTS}(O) > \text{TS}(T_i) \), \( T_i \) would cause a dirty read.
  - Abort \( T_i \) and restart it.
- If \( \text{WTS}(O) > \text{TS}(T_i) \), \( T_i \) would overwrite a ‘later’ value.
  - Don’t need to restart, just ignore the write.
- Otherwise, allow the write and update \( \text{WTS}(O) \).
Problem: Recoverability

What happens if T1 aborts (or the system crashes)?
Timestamp CC and Recoverability

- Buffer all writes until a writer commits.
  - But update WTS(O) when the write to O is allowed.
- Block readers of O until the last writer of O commits.
- Similar to writers holding X locks until commit, but not quite 2PL.
Can we avoid read after write conflicts?
Let writers make a “new” copy, while readers use an appropriate “old” copy.

Readers are always allowed to proceed.

… but may need to be blocked until a writer commits.
Multiversion TS CC

- Each version of an object has:
  - The writing transaction’s TS as its WTS.
  - The highest transaction TS that read it as its RTS.
- Versions are chained backwards in a linked list.
- We can discard versions that are too old to be “of interest”.
- Each transaction classifies itself as a reader or writer for each object that it interacts with.
Reader Transactions

- Find the newest version with WTS < TS(T)
- Start with the latest, and chain backward.
- Assuming that some version exists for all TS, reader xacts are never restarted!
- … but may block until the writer commits.
Writer Transactions

• Find the newest version $V$ s.t. $WTS < TS(T)$

• If $RTS(V) < TS(T)$ make a copy of $V$ with a pointer to $V$ with $WTS = RTS = TS(T)$.

• The write is buffered until commit, but other transactions can see TS values.

• Otherwise reject the write (and restart)