



Lock Your Database Applications

Chicago, May 17th 2007

php|tek

Lukas Kahwe Smith (lsmith@optaros.com)

http://poteewet.org/files/phptek07/lock_your_db_app.pdf

About Myself

- ◆ Lukas Kahwe Smith
- ◆ Started using PHP in the late PHP3 days
- ◆ Joined PEAR sometime in 2002 to work on MDB
- ◆ Began posting on `internals@lists.php.net` in 2003
- ◆ Started the unofficial official PHP todo list in 2005
- ◆ Makes his living as a consultant for Optaros
 - OSS consulting and system integration firm
 - We are always hiring
 - <http://optaros.com/en/company/careers>
- ◆ Can be reached
 - Via Email: `lsmith@optaros.com`
 - On IRC: "lsmith" on efnet, freenode, ircnet ..
 - In Person: Here or at Ultimate Frisbee tournaments

Terminology and Considerations

- ◆ Data change
 - INSERT, UPDATE, DELETE
- ◆ Transaction
 - Series of SQL statements processed as an atomic unit
- ◆ Ready-only transaction
 - Transaction that contains no data changes
- ◆ Concurrent transactions
 - Two or more transactions who's start or end times overlap
- ◆ Lock
 - Method to prevent concurrent transactions interference
- ◆ Throughput vs. Response time
 - How many requests per second vs. how long one request takes

Painful Reality of Trade Offs

Locking strategies are a **trade off** between optimizing data integrity, performance and usability

Painful Reality of Trade Offs

- ◆ Disallow any data changes
 - Very fast reads (no locking needed)
 - Not very useful (few systems need no data changes)
- ◆ Any data access locks given data until the transaction end
 - Great for data integrity
 - Very bad for concurrency
- ◆ All locks are stored as finely grained as possible
 - Nice for concurrency (*)
 - Very bad for performance (throughput)
 - (*) Low throughput also increases chances of waits

LOCK modes

- ◆ Shared LOCK
 - May coexist with any number of shared LOCKs and one update LOCK
 - Used when reading data

- ◆ Update LOCK
 - May coexist with any number of shared LOCKs, but not with any other update or exclusive LOCKs
 - Used for reading when updating is planned
 - Do not allow writing, contrary to what the name implies
 - Not supported by all RDBMS

- ◆ Exclusive LOCK
 - May not coexist with any other LOCKs
 - Used when writing data
 - Exclusive LOCKs are often upgrades from shared or update LOCKs

LOCK granularity

- ◆ Granularity types
 - Database LOCK
 - Extent LOCK
 - Table LOCK
 - Page LOCK
 - Row LOCK
 - Column LOCK

- ◆ Most granular LOCKs by database
 - MyISAM does table LOCKs
 - InnoDB does row LOCKs
 - BerkleyDB does page LOCKs
 - SQLite does database LOCKs
 - SQL Server does column LOCKs
 - Most others do row LOCKs

More on LOCKs

- ◆ A small grain LOCK implies a shared big grain LOCK
 - Page LOCK implies a shared table LOCK
 - Therefore no exclusive table LOCK is possible
 - This is called an “Intent LOCK”
- ◆ “Escalation” is used to handle high overhead when too many LOCKs of a certain small grain level are created
 - Escalate the LOCK to the next bigger granularity level
- ◆ Explicit “manual” locking is supported by most DBMS
 - LOCK [SHARED | EXCLUSIVE] TABLE[S] <TABLE NAME>

Transactions

- ◆ Group multiple statements into one atomic unit
- ◆ Isolation levels enable deciding what concurrency data integrity problems are tolerable to get better concurrency
 - READ UNCOMMITTED
 - No locks are issues or read, very high concurrency
 - READ COMMITTED
 - Shared locks may be released before transaction end
 - Fairly high concurrency
 - REPEATABLE READS
 - Shared locks not released before transaction end
 - Much reduced concurrency
 - SERIALIZABLE
 - Execute transactions in a manner that produces the same results as executed in serial
 - Severely reduced concurrency

Lost Update

◆ Transaction #1

- 1)...
- 2)READ Row #1
- 3)Data change Row #1
- 4)...
- 5)COMMIT
- 6)...

◆ Transaction #2

- 1)READ Row #1
- 2)...
- 3)...
- 4)Data change Row #1
- 5)...
- 6)COMMIT

- ◆ When Transaction #1 commits, the changes in Transaction #2 are lost
- ◆ May be avoided with READ COMMITTED
 - Useful when you can live with some errors, like a search engine

Dirty Read

◆ Transaction #1

- 1) READ Row #1
- 2) Data change Row #1
- 3)...
- 4) ROLLBACK

◆ Transaction #2

- 1)...
- 2)...
- 3) **Read Row #1**
- 4)...
- 5) COMMIT

- ◆ Transaction #2 reads a row that has not yet been committed
- ◆ May be avoided with READ COMMITTED
 - Often you will not read the same rows again in transaction
 - If you only have a single statement in your transaction

Non-repeatable Read

◆ Transaction #1

- 1)...
- 2)READ Row #1
- 3)...
- 4)...
- 5)READ Row #1
- 6)COMMIT

◆ Transaction #2

- 1)READ Row #1
- 2)...
- 3)Data change Row #1
- 4)COMMIT
- 5)...
- 6)...

- ◆ When Transaction #1 reads the modified row in the second read after Transaction #2 has committed
- ◆ May be avoided with REPEATABLE READ
 - Should be used to transfer money between accounts

Phantoms

◆ Transaction #1

- 1) READ Rows id IN (1-30)
- 2)...
- 3)...
- 4) READ Rows id IN (1-30)
- 5) COMMIT

◆ Transaction #2

- 1)...
- 2) INSERT Row id = 27
- 3) COMMIT
- 4)...
- 5)...

- ◆ When Transaction #1 reads the inserted row in the second read after Transaction #2 has committed
- ◆ May be avoided with SERIALIZABLE
 - Useful when selecting details and aggregates in separate queries inside a banking application
 - Can often be emulated using LOCK TABLE <Table Name>

More on Isolation Levels

- ◆ Unsupported isolation levels may be upgraded automatically
- ◆ Expect lower levels to be prioritized over higher levels
- ◆ Transaction without data changes may be labeled READ ONLY
 - SQL spec allows ignoring this hint
- ◆ Transactions with data changes may be labeled FOR UPDATE
 - Label also works with SELECTs inside a transaction
 - Cause update LOCKs, which can avoid deadlocks
- ◆ Most DBMS default to READ COMMITTED
- ◆ Most DBMS at least also support REPEATABLE READ
- ◆ DBMS will also lock INDEX pages which tend to be
 - More granular because index keys are usually smaller than full rows
 - As a result they are also more “shifter” since data changes cause page shifting and splitting more often

SAVEPOINTS and Isolation Levels

- ◆ Give the ability to partially rollback a transaction
 - Set any number of uniquely identified SAVEPOINTS through out a transaction
 - Optionally rollback to a specific SAVEPOINT
- ◆ Can be used to read rows inside a REPEATABLE READ transaction, but release lock before the end of the transaction
 - `SELECT * FROM Table1;`
 - `SAVEPOINT savepoint1;`
 - `SELECT * FROM Table2;`
 - `/* Release shared lock on Table2 */`
 - `ROLLBACK TO SAVEPOINT savepoint1;`
 - ...
 - `COMMIT;`

Fundamental Looming Thread

Using LOCKs immediately opens the
risk of DEADLOCKS:

Condition when two or more
transactions are **waiting on each
other** to release LOCKs

Anti-Deadlock and Concurrency Tipps

- ◆ If update LOCKs are not supported
 - Emulate them with dummy UPDATE queries
 - UPDATE table1 SET column1 = column1 WHERE ..
 - Escalate manually with LOCK TABLE statement
- ◆ Always process all tables in a fixed order
 - At least follow a specific order (by alphabet) if the order does not matter to reduce the risk
- ◆ Partition data that unlike operations are separated
 - Optionally replicate data for reporting applications, so that reporting queries do not cause locks on other queries
- ◆ Keep transactions as short as possible
 - Split transactions whenever possible
 - Move any heavy processing out side of the transaction
 - Carry as much information over to the next transaction

Hot Spots

- ◆ Concurrent access to same objects that cause exclusive locks
 - All INSERTs usually get written to the last page and therefore cause exclusive LOCKs on that page
 - Row level locking can help here
 - CLUSTERED KEYS on unordered PRIMARY KEYS will cause INSERTs to hit different pages
 - Counter page shifting with PCTREEEE/FILLFACTOR
- ◆ Split INDEX pages usually stored in the same index file
 - Sacrifice space by writing “at the end of extent” instead which may be optionally configured on some DBMS
- ◆ Rows accessed by SEQUENCES and AUTO INCREMENTED or other monotonic values will lead to reading same index page
 - Store monotonic value in reverse (123 => 321)
 - Use Global Unique Identifier (GUID)
 - Add the sequence number to some nearly unique non number value derived from the row (like a name)

MVCC – Multi Version Concurrency Control

- ◆ Never lock readers by keeping a copy of all uncommitted changes in open transactions
- ◆ “Overwriting” or “In-Line” MVCC
 - Keep a rollback log of all versions in memory (*)
 - On commit clean up the rollback log and update
 - Oracle, Interbase, InnoDB etc.
 - Can run into issues when rollback log grows too big or lots of expanding data changes cause page shifting
- ◆ “Appending” or “Out-of-Line” MVCC
 - Inserts all updates as new versioned tuples
 - One of the reasons why PostgreSQL needs VACUUM
 - Inefficient for heavy update loads, especially when the tuples sizes are more or less unchanged
- ◆ “Hybrid” MVCC
 - Only overwrite for non expanding changes, else append

MVCC Example

◆ Transaction #1

- 1) BEGIN TRANSACTION
- 2)
- 3) 23F on LH11 is available
- 4) Reserve 23F on LH11
- 5)
- 6) COMMIT

◆ Transaction #2

- 1)
- 2) BEGIN TRANSACTION
- 3)
- 4)
- 5) 23F on LH11 is available
- 6)
- 7) Reserve 23F on LH11
- 8) COMMIT => 23F on LH11 is reserved twice

- ◆ Without MVCC Transaction #2 would have to WAIT for Transaction #1 to COMMIT in 5)
- ◆ Good implementation ROLLBACK in 7) to prevent 8)
- ◆ Great if concurrency of writers on one tuple is low
- ◆ Prevents using an index for COUNT(*)

MVCC Example Test

```
// force WAIT by appending "FOR UPDATE"

$select = "SELECT 1 FROM flights WHERE flight = 'LH11' AND
          seat = '23F' AND customer IS NULL";

$update = "UPDATE flights SET customer = 'Smith' WHERE flight
          = 'LH11' AND seat = '23F' AND customer IS NULL";

$db1->beginTransaction(); $db2->beginTransaction();

$result = $db1->queryRow($select, 'boolean'); // true
$result = (bool)$db1->exec($update); // true

$result = $db2->queryRow($select, 'boolean'); // true

$db1->commit();

$result = (bool)$db2->exec($update); // false
```

Optimistic Locking

- ◆ Locking at COMMIT time, rather than during the transaction
 - Assume that no other transaction modifies the tuple between the independent read and the write transaction
 - Fail instead of wait on concurrent transactions
- ◆ Add a unique "counter" to the unique row identifier
 - PK + Timestamp/Sequence
 - INSERT INTO addr (id, cntr, street, city) VALUES (nextval('addr'), unix_t(), 'Foo Street', 'Bar Town');
 - unix_t() = 1179145598
 - SET TRANS ISOLATION LEVEL READ UNCOMMITTED;
SELECT id, cntr, street, city FROM addr; COMMIT;
 - UPDATE addr SET street = 'Foo Ave', cntr = unix_t()
WHERE id = :id AND cntr = 1179145598;
 - Affected rows is 1
 - UPDATE addr SET street = 'Foo Ave', cntr = unix_t()
WHERE id = :id AND cntr = 1179145598;
 - **Affected rows is 0 => Failure!**

References

- ◆ SQL Performance Tuning
 - Book by Peter Gulutzan and Trudy Pelzer
- ◆ Issues with MVCC
 - <http://www.mysqlperformanceblog.com/2007/02/25/pitfalls-of-converting-to-innodb/>
- ◆ InnoDB WAIT timeout
 - http://www.ibphoenix.com/main.nfs?page=ibp_mvcc_roman
- ◆ FOR UPDATE
 - <http://dev.mysql.com/doc/refman/5.0/en/innodb-locking-reads.html>
- ◆ Isolation Level
 - http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Isolation_%28computer_science%29
- ◆ These slides
 - http://pooeteewet.org/files/phptek07/lock_your_db_app.pdf

