RC24088 (W0610-132) October 24, 2006
Computer Science

IBM Research Report

Locking Protocols for Materialized Aggregate Join Views

Gang Luo
IBM Research Division
Thomas J. Watson Research Center
P.O. Box 704
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Jeffrey F. Naughton, Curt J. Ellmann
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Michael W. Watzke
NCR

Research Division
Almaden - Austin - Beijing - Haifa - India - T. J. Watson - Tokyo - Zurich

Locking Protocols for Materialized Aggregate Join Views

Gang Luo[1] Jeffrey F. Naughton[2] Curt J. Ellmann[2] Michael W. Watzke[3]
IBM T.J. Watson Research Center[1] University of Wisconsin-Madison[2] NCR[3]
luog@us.ibm.com naughton@cs.wisc.edu ellmann@wisc.edu michael.watzke@ncr.com

Abstract

The maintenance of materialized aggregate join views is a well-studied problem. However, to date the published literature has largely ignored the issue of concurrency control. Clearly immediate materialized view maintenance with transactional consistency, if enforced by generic concurrency control mechanisms, can result in low levels of concurrency and high rates of deadlock. While this problem is superficially amenable to well-known techniques such as fine-granularity locking and special lock modes for updates that are associative and commutative, we show that these previous high concurrency locking techniques do not fully solve the problem, but a combination of a "value-based" latch pool and these previous high concurrency locking techniques can solve the problem.

Keywords — *Concurrency, Relational Databases, Transaction Processing.*

1. Introduction

Although materialized view maintenance has been well-studied in the research literature [7], with rare exceptions, to date that published literature has ignored concurrency control. In fact, if we use generic concurrency control mechanisms, immediate materialized aggregate join view maintenance becomes extremely problematic — the addition of a materialized aggregate join view can introduce many lock conflicts and/or deadlocks that did not arise in the absence of this materialized view.

As an example of this effect, consider a scenario in which there are two base relations: the *lineitem* relation, and the *partsupp* relation, with the schemas *lineitem* (*orderkey*, *partkey*), and *partsupp* (*partkey*, *suppkey*). Suppose that in transaction T_1 some customer buys items p_{11} and p_{12} in order o_1, which will cause the tuples (o_1, p_{11}) and (o_1, p_{12}) to be inserted into the *lineitem* relation. Also suppose that concurrently in transaction T_2 another customer buys items p_{21} and p_{22} in order o_2. This will cause the tuples (o_2, p_{21}) and (o_2, p_{22}) to be inserted into the *lineitem* relation. Suppose that parts p_{11} and p_{21} come from supplier s_1, while parts p_{12} and p_{22} come from supplier s_2. Then there are no lock conflicts nor is there any potential for deadlock between T_1 and T_2, since the tuples inserted by them are distinct.

Suppose now that we create a materialized aggregate join view *suppcount* to provide quick access to the number of parts ordered from each supplier, defined as follows:

```
create aggregate join view suppcount as
select p.suppkey, count(*)
from lineitem l, partsupp p
where l.partkey=p.partkey
group by p.suppkey;
```

Now both transactions T_1 and T_2 must update the materialized view *suppcount*. Since both T_1 and T_2 update the same pair of tuples in *suppcount* (the tuples for suppliers s_1 and s_2), there are now potential lock conflicts. To make things worse, suppose that T_1 and T_2 request their exclusive locks on *suppcount* in the following order:

(1) T_1 requests a lock for the tuple whose *suppkey*=s_1.

(2) T_2 requests a lock for the tuple whose *suppkey*=s_2.

(3) T_1 requests a lock for the tuple whose *suppkey*=s_2.

(4) T_2 requests a lock for the tuple whose *suppkey*=s_1.



Then a deadlock will occur.

The danger of this sort of deadlock is not necessarily remote. Suppose there are R suppliers, m concurrent transactions, and that each transaction represents a customer buying items randomly from r different suppliers. Then according to [8, page 428-429], if $mr<<R$, the probability that any particular transaction deadlocks is approximately $(m-1)(r-1)^4/(4R^2)$. (If we do not have $mr<<R$, then the probability of deadlock is essentially one.) For reasonable values of R, m, and r, this probability of deadlock is unacceptably high. For example, if $R=3{,}000$, $m=8$, and $r=32$, the deadlock probability is approximately 18%. Merely doubling m to 16 raises this probability to 38%.

In view of this, one alternative is to simply avoid updating the materialized view within the transactions. Instead, we batch these updates to the materialized view and apply them later in separate transactions. This "works"; unfortunately, it requires that the system gives up on serializability and/or recency (it is possible to provide a theory of serializability in the presence of deferred updates if readers of the materialized view are allowed to read old versions of the view [9].) Giving up on serializability and/or recency for materialized views may ultimately turn out to be the best approach for any number of reasons; but before giving up altogether, it is worth investigating techniques that guarantee immediate update propagation with serializability semantics yet still give reasonable performance. Providing such guarantees is desirable in certain cases. (Such guarantees are required in the TPC-R benchmark [14], presumably as a reflection of some real world application demands.) In this paper we explore techniques that can guarantee serializability without incurring high rates of deadlock and lock contention.

Our focus is materialized aggregate join views. In an extended relational algebra, a general instance of such a view can be expressed as $AJV=\gamma(\pi(\sigma(R_1 \bowtie R_2 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_n)))$, where γ is the aggregate operator. SQL allows the aggregate operators *COUNT*, *SUM*, *AVG*, *MIN*, and *MAX*.

However, because *MIN* and *MAX* cannot be maintained incrementally (the problem is deletes/updates — e.g., when the *MIN*/*MAX* value is deleted, we need to compute the new *MIN*/*MAX* value using all the values in the aggregate group [4]), we restrict our attention to the three incrementally updateable aggregate operators: *COUNT*, *SUM*, and *AVG*. Note that:

(1) In practice, *AVG* is computed using *COUNT* and *SUM*, as *AVG=SUM/COUNT* (*COUNT* and *SUM* are distributive while *AVG* is algebraic [5]). In the rest of the paper, we only discuss *COUNT* and *SUM*, while our locking techniques for *COUNT* and *SUM* also apply to *AVG*.

(2) By letting *n=1* in the definition of *AJV*, we include aggregate views over single relations.

A useful observation is that for *COUNT* and *SUM*, the updates to the materialized aggregate join views are associative and commutative, so it really does not matter in which order they are processed. In our running example, the state of *suppcount* after applying the updates of T_1 and T_2 is independent of the order in which they are applied. This line of reasoning leads one to consider locking mechanisms that increase concurrency for associative and commutative operations.

Many special locking modes that support increased concurrency through the special treatment of "hot spot" aggregates in base relations [3, 13, 16] or by exploiting update semantics [2, 15] have been proposed. An early and particularly relevant example of locks that exploit update semantics was proposed by Korth [10]. The basic idea is to identify classes of update transactions so that within each class, the updates are associative and commutative. For example, if a set of transactions update a record by adding various amounts to the same field in the record, they can be run in any order and the final state of the record will be the same, so they can be run concurrently. To ensure serializability, other transactions that read or write the record must conflict with these addition transactions. This insight is captured in Korth's P locking protocol, in which addition transactions get P locks on the records they update through addition, while all

other data accesses are protected by standard S and X locks. P locks do not conflict with each other while they do conflict with S and X locks.

Borrowing this insight, we propose a V locking protocol ("V" for "View.") In it, transactions that cause updates to materialized aggregate join views with associative and commutative aggregates get standard S and X locks on base relations but get V locks on the materialized view. V locks conflict with S and X locks but not with each other. At this level of discussion, V locks appear virtually identical to the special locks (e.g., P locks) in [10].

Unfortunately, purely using V locks cannot fully solve the materialized aggregate join view update problem. Rather, we could end up with what we call "split group duplicates" — multiple tuples in the aggregate join view for the same group, as shown in Section 2 below. To solve the split group duplicate problem, we augment V locks with a "value-based" latch pool. (We will explain what "value-based" means in the next paragraph.) With this pool of latches the semantics of materialized aggregate join views can be guaranteed — at any time, for any aggregate group, either zero or one tuple corresponding to this group exists in a materialized aggregate join view. Also, the probability of lock conflicts and deadlocks is greatly reduced, because latches are only held for a short period, and V locks do not conflict with each other. Hence, the combination of V locks and the latch pool solves the materialized aggregate join view update problem. Note: in a preliminary version of this work [12], we used W locks to solve the split group duplicate problem. The latch pool solution is better than the W lock solution, as acquiring a latch is much cheaper than acquiring a lock [8].

Traditionally, latches are used to protect the physical integrity of certain data structures (e.g., the data structures in a page [8]). In our case, no physical data structure would be corrupted if the latch pool were not used. The latch pool is used to protect the logical integrity of aggregate

operations rather than the physical integrity of the database. This is why in the previous paragraph, we use the term “value-based” latch pool.

Other interesting properties of the V locking protocol exist because transactions getting V locks on materialized aggregate join views must get S and X locks on the base relations mentioned in their definition. The most interesting such property is that V locks can be used to support “direct propagate” updates to materialized views. Also, by considering the implications of the granularity of V locks and the interaction between base relation locks and accesses to the materialized view, we show that one can define a variant of the V locking protocol, the “no-lock” locking protocol, in which transactions do not set any long-term locks on the materialized view. Based on a similar reasoning, we show that the V locking protocol also applies to materialized non-aggregate join views and can yield higher concurrency than the traditional X locking protocol in certain cases.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we explore the split group duplicate problem that arises with a naive use of V locks, and show how this problem can be avoided through the addition of a latch pool. In Section 3, we explore the way V locks can be used to support both direct propagate updates and materialized non-aggregate join view maintenance. We also extend V locks to define a “no-lock” locking protocol. In Section 4, we prove the correctness of the V locking protocol. In Section 5, we investigate the performance of the V locking protocol through a simulation study in a commercial RDBMS. We conclude in Section 6.

2. The Split Group Duplicate Problem

As mentioned in the introduction, we cannot simply use V locks on aggregate join views. This is because for the V lock to work correctly, updates must be classified *a priori* into those that update a field in an existing tuple and those that create a new tuple or delete an existing tuple,

which cannot be done in the view update scenario. For example, consider a materialized aggregate join view *AJV*. The associative and commutative update operations on *AJV* are of the following two forms:

(1) Suppose we insert a tuple into some base relation of *AJV* and generate a new join result tuple *t*. The steps to integrate the join result tuple *t* into the aggregate join view *AJV* are as follows:

    If the aggregate group of tuple *t* exists in *AJV*

        Update the aggregate group in *AJV*;

    Else

        Insert a new aggregate group into *AJV* for tuple *t*;

(2) Suppose we delete a tuple from some base relation of the aggregate join view *AJV*. We compute the corresponding join result tuples. For each such join result tuple *t*, we execute the following steps to remove *t* from the aggregate join view:

    Find the aggregate group of tuple *t* in *AJV*;

    Update the aggregate group in *AJV*;

    If all join result tuples have been removed from the aggregate group

        Delete the aggregate group from *AJV*;

Hence, a transaction cannot know at the outset whether it will cause an update of an existing materialized view tuple, the insertion of a new tuple, or the deletion of an existing tuple. This is different from the case in [10], where updates are classified *a priori* into those that update a field in an existing tuple and those that create a new tuple or delete an existing tuple. If we use X locks for the materialized view updates, we are back to our original problem of high lock conflict and deadlock rates. If we naively use our V locks for these updates, as we will show in Section 2.1, we may run into the split group duplicate problem and the semantics of the aggregate join

view may be violated. (The split group duplicate problem is mainly due to the self-compatibility of V locks. Previous approaches for handling “hot spot” aggregates [2, 3, 13, 15, 16] all use some kind of self-compatible lock modes. Hence, due to a similar reason, they cannot be applied to materialized aggregate join views.)

2.1 An Example of Split Groups

In this subsection, we explore an example of the split group duplicate problem in the case that the aggregate join view *AJV* is stored in a hash file implemented as described by Gray and Reuter [8]. (The case that the view is stored in a heap file is almost identical.) Furthermore, suppose that we are using key-value locking. Suppose the schema of the aggregate join view *AJV* is (*a*, *sum(b)*), where attribute *a* is both the value locking attribute for the view and the hash key for the hash file. Suppose originally the aggregate join view *AJV* contains the tuple (20, 2) and several other tuples, but that there is no tuple whose attribute *a=1*.

Consider the following three transactions *T*, *T′*, and *T″*. Transaction *T* inserts a new tuple into a base relation *R* and this generates the join result tuple (1, 1), which needs to be integrated into *AJV*. Transaction *T′* inserts another new tuple into the same base relation *R* and generates the join result tuple (1, 2). Transaction *T″* deletes a third tuple from base relation *R*, which requires the tuple (20, 2) to be deleted from *AJV*. After executing these three transactions, the tuple (20, 2) should be deleted from *AJV* while the tuple (1, 3) should appear in *AJV*.



Figure 1. Hash file of the aggregate join view *AJV*.

Now suppose that 20 and 1 have the same hash value so that the tuples (20, 2) and (1, 3) are stored in the same bucket *B* of the hash file. Also, suppose that initially there are four pages in bucket *B*: one bucket page P_1 and three overflow pages P_2, P_3, and P_4, as illustrated in Figure 1. Furthermore, let pages P_1, P_2, and P_3 be full while there are several open slots in page P_4.

To integrate a join result tuple t_1 into the aggregate join view *AJV*, a transaction *T* performs the following steps [8]:

1. Get an X value lock for $t_1.a$ on *AJV*. This lock is held until *T* commits/aborts.
2. Apply the hash function to $t_1.a$ to find the corresponding hash table bucket *B*.
3. Crab all the pages in bucket *B* to see whether a tuple t_2 whose attribute $a=t_1.a$ already exists. ("Crabbing" [8] means first getting an X latch on the next page, then releasing the X latch on the current page.)
4. If t_2 exists in some page *P* in bucket *B*, stop the crabbing and integrate the join result tuple t_1 into tuple t_2. The X latch on page *P* is released only after the integration is finished.
5. If tuple t_2 does not exist, crab the pages in bucket *B* again to find a page *P* that has enough free space. Insert a new tuple into page *P* for the join result tuple t_1.

Note that the above description is simplified compared to that in [8]. In general, as described in [8, page 850], to request an X latch on a page, we first issue a *bufferfix* request without holding the latch. After the page is fixed in the buffer pool, we issue the latch request. This is to avoid performing I/O while holding a latch [8, page 849].

Suppose now that we use V value locks instead of X value locks in this example and that the three transactions *T*, *T′*, and *T″* are executed in the following sequence:

1. *T* gets a V value lock for attribute *a=1*, applies the hash function to find the corresponding hash table bucket *B*, then crabs all the pages in *B* to see whether a tuple t_2 whose attribute *a=1* already exists in the hash file. After crabbing, it finds that no such tuple t_2 exists.
2. Next transaction *T′* gets a V value lock for attribute *a=1*, applies the hash function to attribute *a=1* to find the corresponding hash table bucket *B*, and crabs all the pages in bucket *B* to see whether a tuple t_2 whose attribute *a=1* already exists in the hash file. After crabbing, it finds that no such tuple t_2 exists.
3. Next, transaction *T* crabs the pages in bucket *B* again, finding that only page P_4 has enough free space. It then inserts a new tuple (1, 1) into page P_4 for the join result tuple (1, 1), commits, and releases the V value lock for attribute *a=1*.



Figure 2. Hash file of the aggregate join view *AJV* – after inserting tuple (1, 1).

4. Then transaction *T″* gets a V value lock for attribute *a=20*, finds that tuple (20, 2) is contained in page P_2, and deletes it (creating an open slot in page P_2). Then *T″* commits, and releases the V value lock for attribute *a=20*.



Figure 3. Hash file of the aggregate join view *AJV* – after deleting tuple (20, 2).

5. Finally, transaction *T′* crabs the pages in bucket *B* again, and finds that page P_2 has an open slot. It inserts a new tuple (1, 2) into page P_2 for the join result tuple (1, 2), commits, and releases the V value lock for attribute *a=1*.



Figure 4. Hash file of the aggregate join view *AJV* – after inserting tuple (1, 2).

Now the aggregate join view *AJV* contains two tuples (1, 1) and (1, 2), whereas it should have only the single tuple (1, 3). This is why we call it the "split group duplicate" problem — the group for "1" has been split into two tuples.

One might think that during crabbing, holding an X latch on the entire bucket *B* could solve the split group duplicate problem. However, there may be multiple pages in the bucket *B* and some of them may not be in the buffer pool. Normally under all circumstances one tries to avoid performing I/O while holding a latch [8, page 849]. Hence, holding an X latch on the entire bucket for the duration of the operation could cause a substantial performance hit.

2.2 Preventing Split Groups with Latches

2.2.1 The Latch Pool

To enable the use of V locks while avoiding split group duplicates, we introduce a latch pool for aggregate join views. The latches in the latch pool guarantee that for each aggregate group, at any time, at most one tuple corresponding to this group exists in the aggregate join view.

For efficiency we pre-allocate a latch pool that contains $N>1$ X (exclusive) latches. We use a hash function *H* that maps key values into integers between 1 and *N*. We use requesting/releasing a latch on key value *v* to mean requesting/releasing the *H(v)*-th latch in the latch pool.

We ensure that the following properties always hold for this latch pool:

(1) During the period that a transaction holds a latch in the latch pool, this transaction does not request another latch in the latch pool.

(2) To request a latch in the latch pool, a transaction must first release all the other latches in the RDBMS (including those latches that are not in the latch pool) that it currently holds.

(3) During the period that a transaction holds a latch in the latch pool, this transaction does not request any lock.

Properties (1) and (2) guarantee that there are no deadlocks between latches. Property (3) guarantees that there are no deadlocks between latches and locks. These properties are necessary, since in an RDBMS, latches are not considered in deadlock detection.

We define a *false latch conflict* as one that arises due to hash conflicts (i.e., $H(v_1)=H(v_2)$ and $v_1 \neq v_2$). The value of N only influences the efficiency of the V locking protocol – the larger the number N, the smaller the probability of having false latch conflicts. It does not affect the correctness of the V locking protocol. In practice, if we use a good hash function [8] and the number N is substantially larger than the number of concurrently running transactions in the RDBMS, the probability of having false latch conflicts should be small. For example, consider the example in the introduction with m concurrent transactions. Suppose H is a perfectly randomized hash function, and that a transaction spends $f\%$ of its execution on holding a latch in the latch pool. Note that $f\%$ is a small fraction, as a latch is only held for a short period. Then following a reasoning similar to that in [8, page 428-429], we can show that when a transaction requests a latch in the latch pool, the probability that it runs into false latch conflict $\approx (m-1) \times f\%/N$.

While holding a latch in the latch pool, we allow I/Os to be performed. This violates the rule according to which latches are usually used [8, page 849]. We think this is acceptable, because in our case, each latch in the latch pool is of a fine granularity: each latch protects only one (in the

absence of hash conflicts) or multiple aggregate groups (in the presence of hash conflicts) in the aggregate join view rather than one or multiple pages.

2.2.2 The V Locking Protocol

In the V locking protocol for materialized aggregate join views, we have three kinds of elementary locks: S, X, and V. The compatibilities among these locks are listed in Table 1, while the lock conversion lattice is shown in Figure 5.

Table 1. Compatibilities among the elementary locks.

	S	X	V
S	yes	no	no
X	no	no	no
V	no	no	yes



Figure 5. The lock conversion lattice of the elementary locks.

In the V locking protocol for materialized aggregate join views, S locks are used for reads, V locks are used for associative and commutative aggregate update writes, while X locks are used for transactions that do both reads and writes. These locks can be of any granularity, and, like traditional S and X locks, can be physical locks (e.g., tuple, page, or table locks) or value locks.

For fine granularity locks, we define the corresponding coarser granularity intention locks [6] as follows. We define an IV lock corresponding to a V lock. The IV lock is similar to the traditional IX lock except that it is compatible with the V lock. For a fine granularity X (S) lock, we use the traditional IX (IS) locks. One can think that IX=IS+IV and X=S+V, as X locks are used for transactions that do both reads and writes, while S/V locks are used for transactions that do reads/writes. We introduce the SIV lock (S+IV) that is similar to the traditional SIX lock, i.e., the SIV lock is only compatible with the IS lock. Note that SIX=S+IX=S+(IS+IV)=(S+IS)+IV=S+IV=SIV, so we do not introduce the SIX lock, as it is the

same as the SIV lock. Similarly, we introduce the VIS lock (V+IS) that is only compatible with the IV lock. Note that VIX=V+IX=V+(IS+IV)=(V+IV)+IS=V+IS=VIS, so we do not introduce the VIX lock, as it is the same as the VIS lock. All these intention locks are used in the same way as that in [6].

The compatibilities among the coarse granularity locks are listed in Table 2, while the lock conversion lattice is shown in Figure 6. Since the use of intention locks is well understood, we do not discuss intention locks further in the rest of this paper.

Table 2. Compatibilities among the coarse granularity locks.

	S	X	V	IS	IX	IV	SIV	VIS
S	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no
X	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
V	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no
IS	yes	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
IX	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	no
IV	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
SIV	no	no	no	yes	no	no	no	no
VIS	no	no	no	no	no	yes	no	no



Figure 6. The lock conversion lattice of the coarse granularity locks.

2.2.3 Using Latches in the Latch Pool

Transactions use the latches in the latch pool in the following way:

(1) To integrate a new join result tuple *t* into an aggregate join view *AJV* (e.g., due to insertion into some base relation of *AJV*), we first put a V lock on *AJV* that will be held until the transaction commits/aborts. Immediately before we start the tuple integration, we request a latch on the group by attribute value of tuple *t*. After integrating tuple *t* into the aggregate join view *AJV*, we release the latch.

(2) To remove a join result tuple from the aggregate join view *AJV* (e.g., due to deletion from some base relation of *AJV*), we only need to put a V lock on *AJV* that will be held until the transaction commits/aborts.

In this way, during aggregate join view maintenance, high concurrency is allowed by the fact that V locks are compatible with themselves. Note that when using V locks, multiple transactions may concurrently update the same tuple in the aggregate join view. Hence, logical undo is required on the aggregate join view *AJV* if the transaction updating *AJV* aborts.

The split group duplicate problem cannot occur because of our use of latches. The reason is as follows. By enumerating all possible cases, we see that the split group duplicate problem will only occur under the following conditions: (1) two transactions integrate two new join result tuples into the aggregate join view *AJV* simultaneously, (2) these two join result tuples belong to the same aggregate group, and (3) no tuple corresponding to that aggregate group currently exists in the aggregate join view *AJV*. Using the latch in the latch pool, one transaction, say *T*, must do the update to the aggregate join view *AJV* first (by inserting a new tuple *t* with the corresponding group by attribute value into *AJV*). During the period that transaction *T* holds the latch on the group by attribute value of *t*, no other transaction can integrate another join result tuple that has the same group by attribute value as tuple *t* into the aggregate join view *AJV*. Then when a subsequent transaction *T´* updates the view, it will see the existing tuple *t*. Hence, transaction *T´* will aggregate its join result tuple that has the same group by attribute value as tuple *t* into tuple *t* (rather than inserting a new tuple into *AJV*).

We refer the reader to Section 4 for the correctness proof of the V locking protocol.

3. Other Uses and Extensions of V Locks

In this section we briefly discuss three other interesting aspects of using V locks for materialized view maintenance. In Section 3.1, we discuss the possibility of supporting direct propagate updates. In Section 3.2, we show how V locks illustrate the possibility of a locking protocol for materialized views that supports serializability without requiring any long-term locks whatsoever on the views. In Section 3.3, we describe how to apply the V locking protocol to non-aggregate join views.

3.1 Direct Propagate Updates

In the preceding sections of this paper, we have assumed that materialized aggregate join views are maintained by first computing the join of the newly updated (inserted, deleted) tuples with the other base relations, then aggregating these join result tuples into the aggregate join view. In this section we will refer to this approach as the "indirect approach" to updating the materialized view. However, in certain situations, it is possible to propagate updates on base relations directly to the materialized view, without computing any join. As we know of at least one commercial system (Teradata) that supports such direct propagate updates, in this section we investigate how they can be handled in our framework.

Direct propagate updates are perhaps most useful in the case of (non-aggregate) join views, so we consider join views in the following discussion. However, the same discussion holds for direct propagate updates to aggregate join views. Our focus in this paper is not to explore the merits of direct propagate updates or when they apply; rather, it is to see how they can be accommodated by the V locking protocol. We begin with an example. Suppose we have two base relations, $A(a, b, c)$ and $B(d, e, f)$. Consider the following join view:

create join view *JV* as
select *A.a, A.b, B.e, B.f* from *A, B* where *A.c=B.d*;

Next consider a transaction *T* that executes the following SQL statement:

delete from *A* where *A.a*=1;

To maintain the join view, transaction *T* only needs to execute the following:

delete from *JV* where *JV.a*=1;

This is a "direct propagate" update, since transaction *T* does not compute a join to maintain the view. Similarly, suppose that a transaction *T′*executes the following SQL statement:

update *B* set *B.e*=4 where *B.f*=3;

To maintain *JV*, *T′*can also do a direct propagate update with the following operation:

update *JV* set *JV.e*=4 where *JV.f*=3;

If these transactions naively use V locks on the materialized view, there is apparently a problem: since two V locks do not conflict, *T* and *T′*can execute concurrently. This is not correct, since there is a write-write conflict between *T* and *T′*on any tuple in *JV* with *a=1* and *f=3*. This could lead to a non-serializable schedule.

One way to prevent this would be to require all direct propagate updates to get X locks on the materialized view tuples that they update while indirect updates still use V locks. While this is correct, it is also possible to use V locks for the direct updates if we require that transactions that update base relations in materialized view definitions get X locks on the tuples in the base relations they update and S locks on the corresponding tuples in the other base relations mentioned in the view definition. Note that:

(1) These are exactly the locks the transactions would acquire if they were using indirect materialized view updates instead of direct propagate updates.

(2) For indirect materialized view updates, the X and S locks on the base relations may cause deadlocks among transactions that update different base relations. However, S-X deadlocks on the base relations are usually not as severe as X-X deadlocks on the aggregate join view,

as base relations often contain many more tuples than the aggregate join view. Moreover, the V locking protocol at least removes the X-X deadlocks on the aggregate join view.

Informally, this approach with V locks works because updates to materialized views (even direct propagate updates) are not arbitrary; rather, they must be preceded by updates to base relations. So if two transactions using V locks would conflict in the join view on some tuple *t*, they must conflict on one or more of the base relations updated by the transactions, and locks at that level will resolve the conflict.

In our running example, *T* and *T´* would conflict on base relation *A* and/or on base relation *B*. Note that these locks could be tuple-level, or table-level, or anything in between, depending on the specifics of the implementation. A formal complete correctness proof of this approach can be done easily by making minor changes to the proof in Section 4.

Unlike the situation for indirect updates to materialized aggregate join views, for direct propagate updates the V lock will not result in increased concurrency over X locks. Our point here is to show that we do not need special locking techniques to handle direct propagate updates: the transactions obtain locks as if they were doing updates indirectly (X locks on the tuples of the base relations they update, S locks on the tuples of the base relations with which they join, and V locks on the tuples of the materialized view.) Then the transactions can use either update approach (direct or indirect) and still be guaranteed of serializability.

3.2 Granularity and the No-Lock Locking Protocol

Unless otherwise specified, throughout the discussion in this paper we have been purposely vague about the granularity of locking. This is because the locks that we discuss and propose in this paper can be implemented at any granularity; the appropriate granularity is a question of

efficiency, not of correctness. However, V locks have some interesting properties with respect to granularity and concurrency, which we explore in this section.

In general, finer granularity locking results in higher concurrency. This is not true of V locks if we consider only transactions that update the materialized views. The reason is that V locks do not conflict with one another, so that a single table-level V lock on a materialized view is the same, with respect to concurrency of update transactions, as many tuple-level V locks on the materialized view.

This is not to say that a single table-level V lock per materialized view is a good idea; indeed, a single table-level V lock will block all readers of the materialized view (since it looks like an X lock to any transaction other than an updater also getting a V lock.) Finer granularity V locks will let readers of the materialized view proceed concurrently with updaters. In a sense, a single V lock on the view merely signals “this materialized view is being updated;” read transactions “notice” this signal when they try to place S locks on the view.

This intuition can be generalized to produce a protocol for materialized views that requires no long-term locks at all on the materialized views. In this protocol, the function provided by the V lock on the materialized view (letting readers know that the view is being updated) is implemented by X locks on the base relations. The observation that limited locking is possible when data access patterns are constrained was exploited in a different context (locking protocols for hierarchical database systems) in [17].

In the no-lock locking protocol, like the V locking protocol, updaters of the materialized view must get X locks on the tuples in the base relations they update and S locks on the tuples in the other base relations mentioned in the view. To interact appropriately with updaters, readers of the materialized view are required to get table-level S locks on all the base relations mentioned in the

view. If the materialized view is being updated, there must be a table-level X (IX, or SIX) lock on one of the base relations involved, so the reader will block on this lock. Updaters of the materialized view need not get V locks on the materialized view (since only they would be obtaining locks on the view, and they do not conflict with each other), although they do require the latches in the latch pool to avoid the split group duplicate problem.

It seems unlikely that in a practical situation this no-lock locking protocol would yield higher performance than the V locking protocol, as in the no-lock locking protocol, readers and updaters of the materialized view cannot run concurrently. However, we present the no-lock locking protocol here as an interesting application of how the semantics of materialized view updates can be exploited to reduce locking on the materialized view while still guaranteeing serializability.

3.3 Applying the V Locking Protocol to Non-aggregate Join Views

Besides aggregate join views, the V locking protocol also applies to (non-aggregate) join views of the form $JV=\pi(\sigma(R_1 \bowtie R_2 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_n))$. In fact, for join views, only V locks are necessary. The latch pool is no longer needed. This is due to the following reasons:

(1) As discussed in Section 3.1, updates to materialized views must be preceded by updates to base relations. So if two transactions using V locks would conflict in the join view on some tuple *t*, they must conflict on one or more of the base relations updated by the transactions, and locks at that level will resolve the conflict.

(2) The split group duplicate problem does not exist on join views.

We refer the reader to Section 4 for a formal complete correctness proof of this approach.

In a practical situation, if a join view contains a large number of duplicate tuples (e.g., due to projection), then the V locking protocol can yield higher performance than the traditional X locking protocol. This is because a join view with a large number of duplicate tuples behaves

much like an aggregate join view with a few tuples, as duplicate tuples are hard to differentiate [11]. This effect is clearer from the correctness proof in Section 4.2.

4. Correctness of the V locking protocol

In this section, we prove the correctness of the V locking protocol. The intuition for this proof is that if two transactions updating the base relations of a join view *JV* have no lock conflict with each other on the base relations of *JV*, they must generate different join result tuples. Additionally, the addition operation for the *SUM* and *COUNT* aggregate operators is both associative and commutative.

We begin by reviewing our assumptions. We assume that an aggregate join view *AJV* is maintained in the following way: first compute the join result tuple(s) resulting from the update(s) to the base relation(s) of *AJV*, then integrate these join result tuple(s) into *AJV*. During aggregate join view maintenance, we put appropriate locks on all the base relations of the aggregate join view (i.e., X locks on the tuples in the base relations updated and S locks on the tuples in the other base relations mentioned in the view definition). We use strict two-phase locking. We assume that the locking mechanism used by the database system on the base relations ensures serializability in the absence of aggregate join views. Unless otherwise specified, all the locks are long-term locks that are held until transaction commits. Transactions updating the aggregate join view obtain V locks and latches in the latch pool as described in the V locking protocol. We make the same assumptions for non-aggregate join views.

We first prove serializability in Section 4.1 for the simple case where projection does not appear in the join view definition, while we consider projection in Section 4.2. In Section 4.3, we prove serializability for the case with aggregate join views $AJV = \gamma(\pi(\sigma(R_1 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_i \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_n)))$, where γ is either *COUNT* or *SUM*.

4.1 Proof for Join Views without Projection

To show that the V locking protocol guarantees serializability, we only need to prove that for a join view $JV=\sigma(R_1 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_i \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_n)$, the following assertions hold (the strict two-phase locking protocol guarantees these four assertions for the base relations) [1, 8]:

(1) Assertion 1: Transaction *T*'s writes to join view *JV* are neither read nor written by other transactions until transaction *T* completes.

(2) Assertion 2: Transaction *T* does not overwrite dirty data of other transactions in join view *JV*.

(3) Assertion 3: Transaction *T* does not read dirty data from other transactions in join view *JV*.

(4) Assertion 4: For any data in join view *JV* that is read by transaction *T*, other transactions do not write it before transaction *T* completes.

That is, we need to prove that no read-write, write-read, or write-write conflicts exist. In our proof, we assume that there are no duplicate tuples in the base relations. (At the cost of some additional complexity, the proof can be extended to handle the case where base relations contain duplicate tuples.)

The proof for the absence of read-write or write-read conflicts is trivial, as V and X locks are not compatible with S locks. In the following, we prove the absence of write-write conflicts. Consider the join result tuple $t_1 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie t_i \bowtie \ldots \bowtie t_n$ in the join view *JV* where tuple $t_i \in R_i$ $(1 \le i \le n)$. To update this join result tuple in the join view *JV*, transaction *T* has to update some tuple in some base relation. Suppose transaction *T* updates tuple t_i in base relation R_i for some $1 \le i \le n$. Then transaction *T* needs to use an X lock to protect tuple $t_i \in R_i$. Also, for join view maintenance, transaction *T* needs to use S locks to protect all the other tuples $t_j \in R_j$ $(1 \le j \le n, j \ne i)$. Then according to the two-phase locking protocol, before transaction *T* finishes execution, no other

transaction can update any tuple $t_k \in R_k$ $(1 \le k \le n)$. That is, no other transaction can update the same join result tuple $t_1 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie t_i \bowtie \ldots \bowtie t_n$ in the join view JV until transaction T finishes execution. For a similar reason, transaction T does not overwrite dirty data of other transactions in the join view JV. ■

4.2 Proof for Join Views with Duplicate-preserving Projection

Now we prove the correctness of the V locking protocol for the general case where $JV = \pi(\sigma(R_1 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_i \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_n))$. We assume that join view JV allows duplicate tuples. If no duplicate tuples are allowed in JV, we assume that each tuple in JV has a *dupcnt* attribute recording the number of copies of that tuple [11], otherwise JV cannot be incrementally maintained efficiently. For example, suppose we do not maintain the *dupcnt* attribute in JV. We delete a tuple from a base relation R_i $(1 \le i \le n)$ of JV and this tuple (when joined with other base relations) produces tuple t in JV. Then we cannot decide whether we should delete tuple t from JV or not, as there may be other tuples in base relation R_i that (when joined with other base relations) also produces tuple t in JV. If we maintain the *dupcnt* attribute in the join view JV, then JV becomes an aggregate join view. The proof for the aggregate join view case is shown in Section 4.3 below. Hence, in the following, we only consider join views that allow duplicate tuples.

For a join view JV with projection, multiple tuples in JV may have the same value due to projection. In this case, the V locking protocol allows multiple transactions to update the same tuple in the join view JV concurrently. Hence, the proof in Section 4.1 no longer works.

We use an example to illustrate the point. Suppose the schema of base relation A is (a, c), the schema of base relation B is (d, e). The join view JV is defined as follows:

create join view *JV* as
select *A.a*, *B.e* from *A*, *B* where *A.c*=*B.d*;

Suppose base relation *A*, base relation *B*, and the join view *JV* originally look as shown in Figure 7.



Figure 7. Original status of base relation *A*, base relation *B*, and join view *JV*.

Consider the following two transactions. Transaction T_1 updates tuple t_{B1} in base relation *B* from (4, 1) to (4, 2). To maintain the join view *JV*, we compute the old and new join result tuples (1, 4, 4, 1) and (1, 4, 4, 2). Then we update tuple t_{JV1} in the join view *JV* from (1, 1) to (1, 2).



Figure 8. Status of base relation *A*, base relation *B*, and join view *JV* – after updating tuple t_{B1}.

Now a second transaction T_2 updates tuple t_{B2} in base relation *B* from (5, 2) to (5, 3). To maintain the join view *JV*, we compute the old and new join result tuples (1, 5, 5, 2) and (1, 5, 5, 3). Then we need to update one tuple in the join view *JV* from (1, 2) to (1, 3). Since all the tuples in the join view *JV* have value (1, 2) at present, it makes no difference which tuple we select to update. Suppose we select tuple t_{JV1} in the join view *JV* for update.



Figure 9. Status of base relation *A*, base relation *B*, and join view *JV* – after updating tuple t_{B2}.

Note that transactions T_1 and T_2 update the same tuple t_{JV1} in the join view *JV*. At this point, if we abort transaction T_1, we cannot change tuple t_{JV1} in the join view *JV* back to the value (1, 1), as the current value of tuple t_{JV1} is (1, 3) rather than (1, 2). However, we can pick up any other tuple (such as t_{JV2}) in the join view *JV* that has value (1, 2) and change its value back to (1, 1). That is, our V locking protocol requires logical undo (instead of physical undo) on the join view if the transaction holding the V lock aborts. During logical undo, no additional lock is needed. This is because V locks can "conceptually" be regarded as value locks. The value of the other tuple (such as t_{JV2}), (1, 2), has been locked before.

In the following, we give an "indirect" proof of the correctness of the V locking protocol using the serializability result in Section 4.1. Our intuition is that although multiple tuples in the join view *JV* may have the same value due to projection, they originally come from different join result tuples before projection. Hence, we can show serializability by "going back" to the original join result tuples.

Consider an arbitrary database *DB* containing multiple base relations and join views. Suppose that there is another database *DB´* that is a "copy" of *DB*. The only difference between *DB* and *DB´* is that for each join view with projection $JV=\pi(\sigma(R_1 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_i \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_n))$ in *DB*, we replace it by a join view without projection $JV'=\sigma(R_1 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_i \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_n)$ in *DB´*. Hence, $JV=\pi(JV')$. Each tuple *t* in the join view *JV* corresponds to one tuple *t´* in *JV´* (by projection).

Consider multiple transactions T_1, T_2, …, and T_g. To prove serializability, we need to show that in *DB*, any allowed concurrent execution of these transactions is equivalent to some serial execution of these transactions. Suppose that multiple transactions T_1', T_2', …, and T_g' exist in *DB´*. Each transaction T_j' $(1 \le j \le g)$ is a "copy" of transaction T_j with the following differences:

(1) Suppose in *DB*, transaction T_j reads tuples Δ of *JV*. In *DB*′, we let transaction T_j′ read the tuples Δ′ in *JV*′ that correspond to Δ in *JV*.

(2) Suppose in *DB*, transaction T_j updates *JV* by Δ. According to the join view maintenance algorithm, transaction T_j needs to first compute the corresponding join result tuples Δ′ that produce Δ, then integrate Δ′ into *JV*. In *DB*′, we let transaction T_j′ update *JV*′ by Δ′. That is, we always keep $JV=\pi(JV')$.

Hence, except for the projection on the join views,

(1) For every j ($1 \le j \le g$), transactions T_j′ and T_j read and write the "same" tuples.

(2) At any time, *DB*′ is always a "copy" of *DB*.

For any allowed concurrent execution *CE* of transactions T_1, T_2, …, and T_g in *DB*, we consider the corresponding (and also allowed) concurrent execution *CE*′ of transactions T_1′, T_2′, …, and T_g′ in *DB*′. By the reasoning in Section 4.1, we know that in *DB*′, such an concurrent execution *CE*′ of transactions T_1′, T_2′, …, and T_g′ is equivalent to some serial execution of the same transactions. Suppose one such serial execution is transactions T'_{k_1}, T'_{k_2}, …, and T'_{k_g}, where $\{k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_g\}$ is a permutation of $\{1, 2, \ldots, g\}$. Then it is easy to see that in *DB*, the concurrent execution *CE* of transactions T_1, T_2, …, and T_g is equivalent to the serial execution of transactions T_{k_1}, T_{k_2}, …, and T_{k_g}. ■

4.3 Proof for Aggregate Join Views

We can also prove the correctness (serializability) of the V locking protocol for aggregate join views. Such a proof is similar to the proof in Section 4.2, so we only point out the differences between these two proofs and omit the details:

(1) For any aggregate join view $AJV=\gamma(\pi(\sigma(R_1 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_i \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_n)))$ in *DB*, we replace it by a join view $JV'=\sigma(R_1 \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_i \bowtie \ldots \bowtie R_n)$ in *DB´*. Each tuple in the aggregate join view *AJV* corresponds to one or multiple tuples in *JV´* (by projection and aggregation). At any time, we always keep $AJV=\gamma(\pi(JV'))$, utilizing the fact that the addition operation for the *SUM* and *COUNT* aggregate operators is both associative and commutative.

(2) In the presence of updates that cause the insertion or deletion of tuples in the aggregate join view, the latches in the latch pool guarantee that the "race" conditions that can cause the split group duplicate problem cannot occur. For each aggregate group, at any time at most one tuple corresponding to this group exists in the aggregate join view *AJV*.

5. Performance of the V Locking Protocol

In this section, we investigate the performance of the V locking protocol through a simulation study in IBM's DB2 Version 7.2. We focus on the throughput of a targeted class of transactions (i.e., transactions that update a base relation of an aggregate join view). Our measurements were performed with the database client application and server running on an Intel x86 Family 6 Model 5 Stepping 3 workstation with four 400MHz processors, 1GB main memory, six 8GB disks, and running the Microsoft Windows 2000 operating system. We allocated a processor and a disk for each data server node, so there were four data server nodes on the workstation.

5.1 Benchmark Description

We used the two relations *lineitem* and *partsupp* and the aggregate join view *suppcount* that are mentioned in the introduction for the tests. The schemas of the *lineitem* and *partsupp* relations are listed as follows:

lineitem (orderkey, partkey, price, discount, tax, orderdate, comment)

partsupp (partkey, suppkey, supplycost, comment)

The underscore indicates the partitioning attributes. The aggregate join view *suppcount* is partitioned on the *suppkey* attribute. For each relation, we built an index on the partitioning attribute. In our tests, different *partsupp* tuples have different *partkey* values. There are *R* different *suppkey*s, each corresponding to the same number of tuples in the *partsupp* relation.

Table 3. Test data set.

	number of tuples	total size
lineitem	8M	586MB
partsupp	0.25M	29MB

We used the following kind of transaction for testing:

T: Insert *r* tuples that have a specific *orderkey* value into the *lineitem* relation. Each of these *r* tuples has a different and random *partkey* value and matches a *partsupp* tuple on the *partkey* attribute.

We evaluated the performance of our V lock method and the traditional X lock method in the following way:

(1) We used the default setting of DB2, where the buffer pool size is 250 pages on each data server node. (We also tested larger buffer pool sizes. The results were similar and thus omitted.)

(2) We ran *x T*'s. Each of these *x T*'s has a different *orderkey* value. *x* is an arbitrarily large number. Its specific value does not matter, as we only focused on throughput.

(3) In the X lock method, if a transaction deadlocked and aborted, we automatically re-executed it until it committed.

(4) We used the tuple throughput (number of tuples inserted successfully per second) as the performance metric. It is easy to see that the transaction throughput = the tuple throughput / *r*. In the rest of Section 5, we use throughput to refer to the tuple throughput.

(5) We performed a concurrency test. We fixed *R=3,000*. In both the V lock method and the X lock method, we tested four cases: *m=2*, *m=4*, *m=8*, and *m=16*, where *m* is the number of concurrent transactions. In each case, we let *r* vary from 1 to 64. (We also performed a number of aggregate groups test that varies *R*. The results of this test did not provide more insight so we omit them here.)

(6) We could not implement our V locking protocol in the database software, as we did not have access to the source code. Since the essence of the V locking protocol is that V locks do not conflict with each other, we used the following method to evaluate the performance of the V lock method. We created *m* copies of the aggregate join view *suppcount*. At any time, each of the *m* concurrent transactions dealt with a different copy of *suppcount*. In an actual implementation of the V locking protocol, we would encounter the following issues:

   (a) Conflicts of short-term X page latches and conflicts of the latches in the latch pool during concurrent updates to the aggregate join view *suppcount*.

   (b) Hardware cache invalidation in an SMP environment during concurrent updates to the aggregate join view *suppcount*.

   As a result, our performance numbers are not exact performance predictions, which will depend upon the actual implementation details of the V locking protocol. Rather, our experiments are intended to illustrate trends of when the V lock method tends to do better than the X lock method.

5.2 Concurrency Test Results

We discuss the deadlock probability and throughput testing results from the concurrency test in Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2, respectively.

5.2.1 Deadlock Probability

As mentioned in the introduction, for the X lock method, we can use the formula $(m-1)(r-1)^4/(4R^2)$ to roughly estimate the probability that any particular transaction deadlocks. We show the deadlock probability of the X lock method computed by the formula in Figure 10. (Note: all figures in Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 use logarithmic scale for the x-axis.)



Figure 10. Predicted deadlock probability of the X lock method (concurrency test).



Figure 11. Measured deadlock probability of the X lock method (concurrency test).

For the X lock method, the deadlock probability increases linearly with both *m* and the fourth power of *r*. When both *m* and *r* are small, this deadlock probability is small. However, when either *m* or *r* becomes large, this deadlock probability approaches 1 quickly. For example, consider the case with *m=16*. When *r=16*, this deadlock probability is only 2%. However, when *r=32*, this deadlock probability becomes 38%. The larger *r*, the smaller *m* is needed to make this deadlock probability become close to 1.

We show the deadlock probability of the X lock method measured in our tests in Figure 11. Figures 10 and 11 roughly match. This indicates that our formula gives a fairly good rough estimate of the deadlock probability of the X lock method.

To see how deadlocks influence performance, we investigated the relationship between the throughput and the deadlock probability. By definition, when the deadlock probability becomes close to 1, almost every transaction will deadlock. Deadlock has the following negative influences on throughout:

(1) Deadlock detection/resolution is a time-consuming process. During this period, the deadlocked transactions cannot make any progress.

(2) The deadlocked transactions will be aborted and re-executed. During re-execution, these transactions may deadlock again. This wastes system resources.

Hence, once the system starts to deadlock, the deadlock problem tends to become worse and worse. Eventually, the throughput of the X lock method deteriorates significantly.

5.2.2 Throughput

We show the throughput of the X lock method in Figure 12. (The throughput numbers in Figures 12 and 13 are scaled by the same constant factor.) For a given *m*, when *r* is small, the throughput of the X lock method keeps increasing with *r*. This is because executing a large transaction is much more efficient than executing a large number of small transactions. When *r* becomes large enough (e.g., *r=32*), the X lock method causes a large number of deadlocks. That is, the X lock method runs into a severe deadlock problem. The larger *m*, the smaller *r* is needed for the X lock method to run into the deadlock problem. Once the deadlock problem occurs, the throughput of the X lock method deteriorates significantly. Actually, it decreases as *r* increases. This is because the larger *r*, the more transactions are aborted and re-executed due to deadlock.



Figure 12. Throughput of the X lock method (concurrency test).



Figure 13. Throughput of the V lock method (concurrency test).



Figure 14. Throughput improvement gained by the V lock method (concurrency test).

For a given *r*, before the deadlock problem occurs, the throughput of the X lock method increases with *m*. This is because the larger *m*, the higher concurrency in the RDBMS. However,

when *r* is large enough (e.g., *r=32*) and the X lock method runs into the deadlock problem, due to the extreme overhead of repeated transaction abortion and re-execution, the throughput of the X lock method decreases as *m* increases.

We show the throughput of the V lock method in Figure 13. The general trend of the throughput of the V lock method is similar to that of the X lock method (before the deadlock problem occurs). That is, the throughput of the V lock method increases with both *m* and *r*. However, the V lock method never deadlocks. For a given *m*, the throughput of the V lock method keeps increasing with *r* (until all system resources become fully utilized). Once the X lock method runs into the deadlock problem, the V lock method exhibits great performance advantages over the X lock method.

We show the ratio of the throughput of the V lock method to that of the X lock method in Figure 14. (Note that Figure 14 uses logarithmic scale for both the x-axis and the y-axis.) Before the X lock method runs into the deadlock problem, the throughput of the V lock method is the same as that of the X lock method. However, when the X lock method runs into the deadlock problem, the throughput of the V lock method does not drop while the throughput of the X lock method is significantly worse. In this case, the ratio of the throughput of the V lock method to that of the X lock method is greater than 1. For example, when *r=32*, for any *m*, this ratio is at least 1.3. When *r=64*, for any *m*, this ratio is at least 3. In general, when the X lock method runs into the deadlock problem, this ratio increases with both *m* and *r*. This is because the larger *m* or *r*, the easier the transactions deadlock in the X lock method. The extreme overhead of repeated transaction abortion and re-execution exceeds the benefit of the higher concurrency (efficiency) brought by a larger *m* (*r*).

Note:

(1) Our tests do not address the performance impact of N – the number of X latches in the latch pool. In general, we cannot control the number of aggregate groups in an aggregate join view, which is usually small due to aggregation. However, we can control the number N, which can be relatively large since each latch only occupies a few bytes [8]. As mentioned in Section 2.2.1, we would expect the performance impact of N to be relatively small compared to the performance impact of lock conflicts.

(2) In general, locks are long-term and not released until transaction commit time; latches are short-term and will be released quickly [8]. Hence, in the case that all updates are concentrated on a single tuple in the aggregate join view, we would still expect the V lock method to perform better than the X lock method. However, without an actual implementation of the V locking protocol, it is difficult to measure precisely the benefit of the V lock method over the X lock method in this case.

6. Conclusion

The V locking protocol is designed to support concurrent, immediate updates of materialized aggregate join views without engendering the high lock conflict rates and high deadlock rates that could result if two-phase locking with S and X lock modes were used. This protocol borrows from the theory of concurrency control for associative and commutative updates, with the addition of a latch pool to deal with insertion anomalies that result from some special properties of materialized view updates. Perhaps surprisingly, due to the interaction between locks on base relations and locks on the materialized view, this locking protocol, designed for concurrent update of aggregates, also supports direct propagate updates and materialized non-aggregate join view maintenance.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank C. Mohan, Henry F. Korth, David B. Lomet, and the anonymous reviewers for useful discussions. This work was supported by the NCR Corporation and also by NSF grants CDA-9623632 and ITR 0086002.

References

[1] P.A. Bernstein, V. Hadzilacos, and N. Goodman. Concurrency Control and Recovery in Database Systems. Addison-Wesley publishers, 1987.

[2] B.R. Badrinath, K. Ramamritham. Semantics-Based Concurrency Control: Beyond Commutativity. TODS 17(1): 163-199, 1992.

[3] D. Gawlick, D. Kinkade. Varieties of Concurrency Control in IMS/VS Fast Path. Database Engineering Bulletin 8(2): 3-10, 1985.

[4] J. Gehrke, F. Korn, and D. Srivastava. On Computing Correlated Aggregates over Continual Data Streams. SIGMOD Conf. 2001: 13-24.

[5] J. Gray, A. Bosworth, and A. Layman et al. Data Cube: A Relational Aggregation Operator Generalizing Group-By, Cross-Tab, and Sub-Total. ICDE 1996: 152-159.

[6] J. Gray, R.A. Lorie, and G.R. Putzolu et al. Granularity of Locks and Degrees of Consistency in a Shared Data Base. IFIP Working Conference on Modeling in Data Base Management Systems: 365-394, 1976.

[7] A. Gupta, I.S. Mumick. Materialized Views: Techniques, Implementations, and Applications. MIT Press, 1999.

[8] J. Gray, A. Reuter. Transaction Processing: Concepts and Techniques. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, 1993.

[9] A. Kawaguchi, D.F. Lieuwen, and I.S. Mumick et al. Concurrency Control Theory for Deferred Materialized Views. ICDT 1997: 306-320.

[10] H.F. Korth. Locking Primitives in a Database System. JACM 30(1): 55-79, 1983.

[11] W. Labio, J. Yang, and Y. Cui et al. Performance Issues in Incremental Warehouse Maintenance. VLDB 2000: 461-472.

[12] G. Luo, J.F. Naughton, and C.J. Ellmann et al. Locking Protocols for Materialized Aggregate Join Views. VLDB 2003: 596-607.

[13] P.E. O'Neil. The Escrow Transactional Method. TODS 11(4): 405-430, 1986.

[14] M. Poess, C. Floyd. New TPC Benchmarks for Decision Support and Web Commerce. SIGMOD Record 29(4): 64-71, 2000.

[15] R.F. Resende, D. Agrawal, and A.E. Abbadi. Semantic Locking in Object-Oriented Database Systems. OOPSLA 1994: 388-402.

[16] A. Reuter. Concurrency on High-trafic Data Elements. PODS 1982: 83-92.

[17] A. Silberschatz, Z.M. Kedem. Consistency in Hierarchical Database Systems. JACM 27(1): 72-80, 1980.

7. V Locks, Latches, and B-Trees

In this section, we consider the particularly thorny problem of implementing V locks (with the required latches in the latch pool) in the presence of B-tree indices. This section is included for completeness; typically, implementing high concurrency locking modes poses special challenges when B-trees are considered, and the V locks are no exception. However, we wish to warn the reader that this section is rather intricate and perhaps even tedious; for the reader not interested in these details, the rest of the paper can be safely read and understood while omitting this section.

On B-tree indices, we use value locks to refer to key-range locks. To be consistent with the approach advocated by Mohan [Moh90a], we use next-key locking to implement key-range locking. We use "key" to refer to the indexed attribute of the B-tree index. We assume that the entry of the B-tree index is of the following format: (key value, row id list).

7.1 Split Groups and B-Trees

We begin by considering how split group duplicates can arise when a B-tree index is declared over the aggregate join view *AJV*. Suppose the schema of *AJV* is (*a*, *b*, *sum(c)*), and we build a B-tree index I_B on attribute *a*. Also, assume there is no tuple (1, 2, *X*) in *AJV*, for any *X*. Consider the following two transactions *T* and *T´*. Transaction *T* integrates a new join result tuple (1, 2, 3) into the aggregate join view *AJV* (by insertion into some base relation *R*). Transaction *T´* integrates another new join result tuple (1, 2, 4) into the aggregate join view *AJV* (by insertion into the same base relation *R*). Using standard concurrency control without V locks, to integrate a join result tuple t_1 into the aggregate join view *AJV*, a transaction will execute something like the following operations:

(1) Get an X value lock for $t_1.a$ on the B-tree index I_B. This value lock is held until the transaction commits/aborts.
(2) Make a copy of the row id list in the entry for $t_1.a$ of the B-tree index I_B.
(3) For each row id in the row id list, fetch the corresponding tuple t_2. Check whether or not $t_2.a=t_1.a$ and $t_2.b=t_1.b$.
(4) If some tuple t_2 satisfies the condition $t_2.a=t_1.a$ and $t_2.b=t_1.b$, integrate tuple t_1 into tuple t_2 and stop.
(5) If no tuple t_2 satisfies the condition $t_2.a=t_1.a$ and $t_2.b=t_1.b$, insert a new tuple into *AJV* for tuple t_1. Also, insert the row id of this new tuple into the B-tree index I_B.

Suppose now we use V value locks instead of X value locks and the two transactions *T* and *T´* above are executed in the following sequence:

(1) Transaction *T* gets a V value lock for *a=1* on the B-tree index I_B, searches the row id list in the entry for *a=1*, and finds that no tuple t_2 whose attributes $t_2.a=1$ and $t_2.b=2$ exists in *AJV*.

(2) Transaction T' gets a V value lock for $a=1$ on the B-tree index I_B, searches the row id list in the entry for $a=1$, and finds that no tuple t_2 whose attributes $t_2.a=1$ and $t_2.b=2$ exists in *AJV*.

(3) Transaction T inserts a new tuple $t_1=(1, 2, 3)$ into *AJV*, and inserts the row id of tuple t_1 into the row id list in the entry for $a=1$ of the B-tree index I_B.

(4) Transaction T' inserts a new tuple $t_3=(1, 2, 4)$ into *AJV*, and inserts the row id of tuple t_3 into the row id list in the entry for $a=1$ of the B-tree index I_B.

Now the aggregate join view *AJV* contains two tuples (1, 2, 3) and (1, 2, 4) instead of a single tuple (1, 2, 7); hence, we have the split group duplicate problem.

7.2 Implementing V Locking with B-trees

Implementing a high concurrency locking scheme in the presence of indices is difficult, especially if we consider issues of recoverability. Key-value locking as proposed by Mohan [Moh90a] was perhaps the first published description of the issues that arise and their solution. Unfortunately, we cannot directly use the techniques in [Moh90a] to implement V locks as value (key-range) locks.

To illustrate why, we use the following example. Suppose the schema of the aggregate join view *AJV* is (*a*, *sum(b)*), and a B-tree index is built on attribute *a* of the aggregate join view *AJV*. Suppose originally the aggregate join view *AJV* contains four tuples that correspond to $a=2$, $a=3$, $a=4$, and $a=5$. Consider the following three transactions T, T', and T'' that result in updates to the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction T deletes the tuple whose attribute $a=3$ (by deletion from some base relation R of *AJV*). Transaction T' deletes the tuple whose attribute $a=4$ (by deletion from the same base relation R of *AJV*). Transaction T'' reads those tuples whose attribute a is between 2 and 5. Suppose we ignore the special properties of V locks and use the techniques in [Moh90a] to implement V value locks on the B-tree index. Then the three transactions T, T', and T'' could be executed in the following sequence:

(1) Transaction T puts a V lock for $a=3$ and another V lock for $a=4$ on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	2	3	4	5
T		V	V	

(2) Transaction T' puts a V lock for $a=4$ and another V lock for $a=5$ on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	2	3	4	5
T		V	V	
T'			V	V

(3) Transaction T' deletes the entry for $a=4$ from the B-tree index. Transaction T' commits and releases the two V locks for $a=4$ and $a=5$.

	2	3		5
T		V	V	

(4) Transaction T deletes the entry for $a=3$ from the B-tree index.

	2			5
T		V	V	

(5) Before transaction T finishes execution, transaction T'' finds the entries for $a=2$ and $a=5$ in the B-tree index. Transaction T'' puts an S lock for $a=2$ and another S lock for $a=5$ on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	2			5
T		V	V	
T''	S			S

In this way, transaction T'' can start execution even before transaction T finishes execution. This is not correct (i.e., serializability can be violated), because there is a write-read conflict between transaction T and transaction T'' (on the tuple whose attribute $a=3$). The main reason that this undesirable situation (transactions with write-read conflict can execute concurrently) occurs is due to the fact that V locks are compatible with themselves. Hence, during the period that a transaction holds a V lock on an object, another transaction may delete this object by acquiring another V lock.

To implement V value locks on B-tree indices correctly, we need to combine those techniques in [Moh90a, GR93] with the technique of logical deletion of keys [Moh90b, KMH97]. In Section 7.2.1, we describe the protocol for each of the basic B-tree operations in the presence of V locks. In Section 7.2.2, we explore the need for the techniques used in Section 7.2.1. We prove the correctness of the implementation method in Section 7.2.3.

7.2.1 Basic Operations for B-tree Indices

In our protocol, there are five operations of interest:

(1) **Fetch**: Fetch the row ids for a given key value v_1.

(2) **Fetch next**: Given the current key value v_1, find the next key value $v_2 > v_1$ existing in the B-tree index, and fetch the row id(s) associated with key value v_2.

(3) **Put an X value lock on key value v_1.**

(4) **Put a first kind V value lock on key value v_1.**

(5) **Put a second kind V value lock on key value v_1.**

Transactions use the latches in the latch pool in the following way:

(1) To integrate a new join result tuple t into an aggregate join view AJV (e.g., due to insertion into some base relation of AJV), we first put a second kind V value lock on the B-tree index. Immediately before we start the tuple integration, we request a latch on the group by attribute value of tuple t. After integrating tuple t into the aggregate join view AJV, we release the latch on the group by attribute value of tuple t.

(2) To remove a join result tuple from the aggregate join view AJV (e.g., due to deletion from some base relation of AJV), we only need to put a first kind V value lock on the B-tree index.

Unlike [Moh90a, GR93], we do not consider the operations of insert and delete. We show why this is by an example. Suppose a B-tree index is built on attribute a of an aggregate join view AJV. Assume we insert a tuple into some base relation of AJV and generate a new join result tuple t. The steps to integrate the join result tuple t into the aggregate join view AJV are as follows:

If the aggregate group of tuple *t* exists in *AJV*

Update the aggregate group in *AJV*;

Else

Insert a new aggregate group into *AJV* for tuple *t*;

Once again, we do not know whether we need to update an existing aggregate group in *AJV* or insert a new aggregate group into *AJV* until we read *AJV*. However, we do know that we need to acquire a second kind V value lock on *t.a* before we can integrate tuple *t* into the aggregate join view *AJV*. Similarly, suppose we delete a tuple from some base relation of the aggregate join view *AJV*. We compute the corresponding join result tuples. For each such join result tuple *t*, we execute the following steps to remove tuple *t* from the aggregate join view *AJV*:

Find the aggregate group of tuple *t* in *AJV*;

Update the aggregate group in *AJV*;

If all join result tuples have been removed from the aggregate group

Delete the aggregate group from *AJV*;

In this case, we do not know whether we need to update an aggregate group in *AJV* or delete an aggregate group from *AJV* in advance. However, we do know that we need to acquire a first kind V value lock on *t.a* before we can remove tuple *t* from the aggregate join view *AJV*.

The ARIES/KVL method described in [Moh90a] for implementing value locks on a B-tree index requires the insertion/deletion operation to be done immediately after a transaction gets appropriate locks. Also, in ARIES/KVL, the value lock implementation method is closely tied to the B-tree implementation method. This is because ARIES/KVL strives to take advantage of both IX locks and instant locks to increase concurrency. In the V locking mechanism, high concurrency has already been guaranteed by the fact that V locks are compatible with themselves.

We can exploit this advantage so that our method for implementing value locks for aggregate join views on B-tree indices is more general and flexible than the ARIES/KVL method. Specifically, in our method, after a transaction gets appropriate locks, we allow it to execute other operations before it executes the insertion/deletion/update/read operation. Also, our value lock implementation method is only loosely tied to the B-tree implementation method.

Our method for implementing value locks for aggregate join views on B-tree indices is as follows. Consider a transaction *T*.

Op1. Fetch: We first check whether some entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index. If such an entry exists, we put an S lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index. If no such entry exists, we find the smallest value v_2 in the B-tree index such that $v_2>v_1$. Then we put an S lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index.

Op2. Fetch next: We find the smallest value v_2 in the B-tree index such that $v_2>v_1$. Then we put an S lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index.

Op3. Put an X value lock on key value v_1: We first put an X lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index. Then we check whether some entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index. If no such entry exists, we find the smallest value v_2 in the B-tree index such that $v_2>v_1$. Then we put an X lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index.

Op4. Put a first kind V value lock on key value v_1: We put a V lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index.

Op5. Put a second kind V value lock on key value v_1: We first put a V lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index. Then we check whether some entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index. If no entry for value v_1 exists, we do the following:

(a) We find the smallest value v_2 in the B-tree index such that $v_2>v_1$. Then we put a short-term V lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index. If the V lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index is acquired as an X lock, we upgrade the V lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index to an X lock. This situation may occur when transaction T already holds an S or X lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index.

(b) We request a latch on value v_2. We insert into the B-tree index an entry for value v_1 with an empty row id list. (Note: that at a later point transaction T will insert a row id into this row id list after transaction T inserts the corresponding tuple into the aggregate join view.) Then we release the latch on value v_2.

(c) We release the short-term V lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index.

Table 4 summarizes the locks acquired during different operations.

Table 4. Summary of locking.

		current key v_1	next key v_2
fetch	v_1 exists	S	
	v_1 does not exist		S
fetch next			S
X value lock	v_1 exists	X	
	v_1 does not exist	X	X
first kind V value lock		V	
second kind V value lock	v_1 exists	V	
	v_1 does not exist and the V lock on v_2 is acquired as a V lock	V	V
	v_1 does not exist and the V lock on v_2 is acquired as an X lock	X	X

During the period that a transaction T holds a first kind V (or second kind V, or X) value lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index, if transaction T wants to delete the entry for value v_1, transaction T needs to do a logical deletion of keys [Moh90b, KMH97] instead of a physical deletion. That is, instead of removing the entry for value v_1 from the B-tree index, it is left there with a *delete_flag* set to 1. If the delete were to be rolled back, then the *delete_flag* is reset to 0. If another transaction inserts an entry for value v_1 into the

B-tree index before the entry for value v_1 is garbage collected, the *delete_flag* of the entry for value v_1 is reset to 0. This is to avoid the potential write-read conflicts discussed at the beginning of Section 7.2.

The physical deletion operations are necessary, otherwise the B-tree index may grow unbounded. To leverage the overhead of the physical deletion operations, we perform them as garbage collection by other operations (of other transactions) that happen to pass through the affected nodes in the B-tree index [KMH97]. That is, a node reorganization operation checks all the entries in a leaf of the B-tree index and removes all such entries that have been marked deleted and currently have no locks on them. This can be implemented in the following way. We introduce a special short-term Z lock mode that is not compatible with any lock mode (including itself). No lock can be upgraded to a Z lock. A transaction *T* can get a Z lock on an object if no transaction (including transaction *T* itself) is currently holding any lock on this object. Also, during the period that transaction *T* holds a Z lock on an object, no transaction (including transaction *T* itself) can be granted another lock (including Z lock) on this object.

Note the Z lock mode is different from the X lock mode. For example, if transaction *T* itself is currently holding an S lock on an object, transaction *T* can still get an X lock on this object. That is, transaction *T* can get an X lock on an object if no other transaction is currently holding any lock on this object. For each entry with value *v* whose *delete_flag=1*, we request a conditional Z lock (conditional locks are discussed in [Moh90a]) for value *v*. If the conditional Z lock request is granted, we delete this entry from the leaf of the B-tree index, then we release the Z lock. If the conditional Z lock request is denied, we do not do anything with this entry. Then the physical deletion of this entry is left to other future operations.

We use the Z lock (instead of X lock) to prevent the following undesirable situation: a transaction that is currently using an entry (e.g., holding an S lock on the entry), where the entry is marked logically deleted, tries to physically delete this entry. Z locks can be implemented easily using the techniques in [GR93, Chapter 8] (by making small changes to the lock manager). Note the above method is different from the method described in [Moh90b] while both methods work. We choose the Z lock method to simplify our key-range locking protocol for aggregate join views on B-tree indices. As mentioned in [Moh90b], the log record for garbage collection is a redo-only log record.

In Op4 (put a first kind V value lock on key value v_1), usually an entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index. However, the situation that no entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index is still possible. To illustrate this, consider an aggregate join view *AJV* that is defined on base relation *R* and several other base relations. Suppose a B-tree index I_B is built on attribute *d* of the aggregate join view *AJV*. If we insert a new tuple *t* into base relation *R* and generate several new join result tuples, we need to acquire the appropriate second kind V value locks on the B-tree index I_B before we can integrate these new join result tuples into the aggregate join view *AJV*. If we delete a tuple *t* from base relation *R*, to maintain the aggregate join view *AJV*, normally we need to first compute the corresponding join result tuples that are

to be removed from the aggregate join view *AJV*. These join result tuples must have been integrated into the aggregate join view *AJV* before. Hence, when we acquire the first kind V value locks for their *d* attribute values, these *d* attribute values must exist in the B-tree index I_B.

However, there is an exception. Suppose attribute *d* of the aggregate join view *AJV* comes from base relation *R*. Consider the following scenario (see Section 3.1 for details). There is only one tuple *t* in base relation *R* whose attribute *d=v*. However, there is no matching tuple in the other base relations of the aggregate join view *AJV* that can be joined with tuple *t*. Hence, there is no tuple in the aggregate join view *AJV* whose attribute *d=v*. Suppose transaction *T* executes the following SQL statement:

delete from *R* where *R.d=v*;

In this case, to maintain the aggregate join view *AJV*, there is no need for transaction *T* to compute the corresponding join result tuples that are to be removed from the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T* can execute the following "direct propagate" update operation:

delete from *AJV* where *AJV.d=v*;

Then when transaction *T* requests a first kind V value lock for *d=v* on the B-tree index I_B, transaction *T* will find that no entry for value *v* exists in the B-tree index I_B.

In Op4 (put a first kind V value lock on key value v_1), even if no entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index, we still only need to put a V lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index. There is no need to put any lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index. That is, no next-key locking is necessary in this case. This is because the first kind V value lock can only be used to remove a join result tuple from the aggregate join view *AJV*. In the case that no entry for value v_1 currently exists in the B-tree index, usually no join result tuple for value v_1 can be removed from the aggregate join view *AJV* (unless another transaction inserts an entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index), since no join result tuple currently exists for value v_1. Then the first kind V value lock on key value v_1 is used to protect a null operation. Therefore, no next-key locking is necessary. Note: it is possible that after transaction *T* gets the first kind V value lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index, another transaction inserts an entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index. Hence, we cannot omit the V lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index. This effect is clearer from the correctness proof in Section 7.2.3.

7.2.2 Are These Techniques Necessary?

The preceding section is admittedly dense and intricate, so it is reasonable to ask if all this effort is really necessary. Unfortunately the answer appears to be yes — we use the following aggregate join view *AJV* to illustrate the rationale for the techniques introduced in the previous section. The schema of the aggregate join view *AJV* is (*a*, *sum(b)*). Suppose a B-tree index is built on attribute *a* of the aggregate join view *AJV*. We show that if any of the techniques from the previous section are omitted (and not replaced by other equivalent techniques), then we cannot guarantee serializability.

Technique 1. As mentioned above in Op5 (put a second kind V value lock on key value v_1), we need to request a latch on value v_2. To illustrate why, we use the following example. Suppose originally the aggregate join view *AJV* contains two tuples that correspond to *a=1* and *a=4*. Consider the following three transactions *T*, *T′*, and *T″* on the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T* integrates a new join result tuple (3, 5) into the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T′* integrates a new join result tuple (2, 6) into the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T″* reads those tuples whose attribute *a* is between 1 and 3. Suppose we do not request a latch on value v_2. Also, suppose the three transactions *T*, *T′*, and *T″* are executed in the following way:

(1) Transaction *T* puts a V lock for *a=3* and another V lock for *a=4* on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	1			4
T			V	V

(2) Transaction *T′* finds the entries for *a=1* and *a=4* in the B-tree index. Transaction *T′* puts a V lock for *a=2* and another V lock for *a=4* on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	1			4
T			V	V
T′		V		V

(3) Transaction *T* inserts the tuple (3, 5) and an entry for *a=3* into the aggregate join view *AJV* and the B-tree index, respectively.

	1		3	4
T			V	V
T′		V		V

(4) Transaction *T* commits and releases the V lock for *a=3* and the V lock for *a=4*.

	1		3	4
T′		V		V

(5) Before transaction *T′* inserts the entry for *a=2* into the B-tree index, transaction *T″* finds the entries for *a=1*, *a=3*, and *a=4* in the B-tree index. Transaction *T″* puts an S lock for *a=1* and another S lock for *a=3* on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	1		3	4
T′		V		V
T″	S		S	

In this way, transaction *T″* can start execution even before transaction *T′* finishes execution. This is not correct, because there is a write-read conflict between transaction *T′* and transaction *T″* (on the tuple whose attribute *a=2*).

Technique 2. As mentioned above in Op5 (put a second kind V value lock on key value v_1), if the V lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index is acquired as an X lock, we need to upgrade the V lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index to an X lock. To illustrate why, we use the following example. Suppose originally the aggregate join view *AJV* contains only one tuple that corresponds to *a=4*. Consider the following two transactions *T* and *T′* on the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T* first reads those tuples whose attribute *a* is between 1 and 4, then integrates a new join result tuple (3, 6) into the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T′* integrates a new join result tuple (2, 5) into the aggregate join view *AJV*. Suppose we

do not upgrade the V lock for value v_1 on the B-tree index to an X lock. Also, suppose the two transactions *T* and *T′* are executed in the following way:

(1) Transaction *T* finds the entry for *a=4* in the B-tree index. Transaction *T* puts an S lock for *a=4* on the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T* reads the tuple in *AJV* whose attribute *a=4*.

			4
T			S

(2) Transaction *T* puts a V lock for *a=3* and another V lock for *a=4* on the aggregate join view *AJV*. Note the V lock for *a=4* is acquired as an X lock since transaction *T* has already put an S lock for *a=4* on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

			4
T		V	X

(3) Transaction *T* inserts the tuple (3, 6) and an entry for *a=3* into the aggregate join view *AJV* and the B-tree index, respectively. Then transaction *T* releases the V lock for *a=4* on the aggregate join view *AJV*. Note transaction *T* still holds an X lock for *a=4* on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

		3	4
T		V	X

(4) Before transaction *T* finishes execution, transaction *T′* finds the entries for *a=3* and *a=4* in the B-tree index. Transaction *T′* puts a V lock for *a*=2 and another V lock for *a=3* on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

		3	4
T		V	X
T′	V	V	

In this way, transaction *T′* can start execution even before transaction *T* finishes execution. This is not correct, because there is a read-write conflict between transaction *T* and transaction *T′* (on the tuple whose attribute *a=2*).

Technique 3. As mentioned above in Op5 (put a second kind V value lock on key value v_1), if no entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index, we need to insert an entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index. To illustrate why, we use the following example. Suppose originally the aggregate join view *AJV* contains two tuples that correspond to *a=1* and *a=5*. Consider the following three transactions *T*, *T′*, and *T″* on the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T* integrates two new join result tuples (4, 5) and (2, 6) into the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T′* integrates a new join result tuple (3, 7) into the aggregate join view *AJV*. Transaction *T″* reads those tuples whose attribute *a* is between 1 and 3. Suppose we do not insert an entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index. Also, suppose the three transactions *T*, *T′*, and *T″* are executed in the following way:

(1) Transaction *T* finds the entries for *a=1* and *a=5* in the B-tree index. For the new join result tuple (4, 5), transaction *T* puts a V lock for *a=4* and another V lock for *a=5* on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	1				5
T				V	V

(2) Transaction *T* finds the entries for *a=1* and *a=5* in the B-tree index. For the new join result tuple (2, 6), transaction *T* puts a V lock for *a=2* and another V lock for *a=5* on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	1				5
T		V		V	V

(3) Transaction *T* inserts the tuple (4, 6) and an entry for *a=4* into the aggregate join view *AJV* and the B-tree index, respectively.

	1			4	5
T		V		V	V

(4) Transaction *T′* finds the entries for *a=1*, *a=4*, and *a=5* in the B-tree index. Transaction *T′* puts a V lock for *a=3* and another V lock for *a=4* on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	1			4	5
T		V		V	V
T′			V	V	

(5) Transaction T' inserts the tuple (3, 7) and an entry for $a=3$ into the aggregate join view *AJV* and the B-tree index, respectively.

	1		3	4	5
T		V		V	V
T'			V	V	

(6) Transaction T' commits and releases the two V locks for $a=3$ and $a=4$.

	1		3	4	5
T		V		V	V

(7) Before transaction T inserts the entry for $a=2$ into the B-tree index, transaction T'' finds the entries for $a=1$, $a=3$, $a=4$, and $a=5$ in the B-tree index. Transaction T'' puts an S lock for $a=1$ and another S lock for $a=3$ on the aggregate join view *AJV*.

	1		3	4	5
T		V		V	V
T''	S		S		

In this way, transaction T'' can start execution even before transaction T finishes execution. This is not correct, because there is a write-read conflict between transaction T and transaction T'' (on the tuple whose attribute $a=2$).

7.2.3 Correctness of the Key-range Locking Protocol

In this section, we prove the correctness (serializability) of our key-range locking strategy for aggregate join views on B-tree indices. Suppose a B-tree index I_B is built on attribute d of an aggregate join view *AJV*. To prove serializability, for any value v_1 (no matter whether or not an entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index, i.e., the phantom problem [GR93] is also considered), we only need to show that there is no read-write, write-read, or write-write conflict between two different transactions on those tuples of the aggregate join view *AJV* whose attribute d has value v_1 [BHG87, GR93]. As shown in [Kor83], write-write conflicts are avoided by the associative and commutative properties of the addition operation. Furthermore, the use of the latches in the latch pool guarantees that for each aggregate group, at any time at most one tuple corresponding to this group exists in the aggregate join view *AJV*. We enumerate all the possible cases to show that write-read and read-write conflicts do not exist. Since we use next-key locking, in the enumeration, we only need to focus on value v_1 and the smallest existing value v_2 in the B-tree index I_B such that $v_2>v_1$.

Consider the following two transactions T and T'. Transaction T updates (some of) the tuples in the aggregate join view *AJV* whose attribute d has value v_1. Transaction T' reads the tuples in the aggregate join view *AJV* whose attribute d has value v_1 (e.g., through a range query). Suppose v_2 is the smallest existing value in the B-tree index I_B such that $v_2>v_1$. Transaction T needs to get a first kind V (or second kind V, or X) value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B. Transaction T' needs to get an S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B. There are four possible cases:

(1) Case 1: An entry E for value v_1 already exists in the B-tree index I_B. Also, transaction T' gets the S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B first.

To put an S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B, transaction T' needs to put an S lock for $d=v_1$ on AJV. During the period that transaction T' holds the S lock for $d=v_1$ on AJV, the entry E for value v_1 always exists in the B-tree index I_B. Then during this period, transaction T cannot get the V (or V, or X) lock for $d=v_1$ on AJV. That is, transaction T cannot get the first kind V (or second kind V, or X) value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B.

(2) Case 2: An entry E for value v_1 already exists in the B-tree index I_B. Also, transaction T gets a first kind V (or second kind V, or X) value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B first.

To put a first kind V (or second kind V, or X) value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B, transaction T needs to put a V (or V, or X) lock for $d=v_1$ on AJV. During the period that transaction T holds the V (or V, or X) lock for $d=v_1$ on AJV, the entry E for value v_1 always exists in the B-tree index I_B. Note during this period, if some transaction deletes the entry E for value v_1 from the B-tree index I_B, the entry E is only logically deleted. Only after transaction T releases the V (or V, or X) lock for $d=v_1$ on AJV may the entry E for value v_1 be physically deleted from the B-tree index I_B. Hence, during the period that transaction T holds the V (or V, or X) lock for $d=v_1$ on AJV, transaction T' cannot get the S lock for $d=v_1$ on AJV. That is, transaction T' cannot get the S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B.

(3) Case 3: No entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index I_B. Also, transaction T' gets the S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B first.

To put an S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B, transaction T' needs to put an S lock for $d=v_2$ on AJV. During the period that transaction T' holds the S lock for $d=v_2$ on AJV, no other transaction T'' can insert an entry for value v_3 into the B-tree index I_B such that $v_1 \leq v_3 < v_2$. This is because to do so, transaction T'' needs to get a V (or X) lock for $d=v_2$ on AJV. Then during the period that transaction T' holds the S lock for $d=v_2$ on AJV, transaction T cannot get the second kind V (or X) value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B. This is because to do so, transaction T needs to get a V (or X) lock for $d=v_2$ on AJV. Note during the period that transaction T' holds the S lock for $d=v_2$ on AJV, transaction T can get the first kind V value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B. This is because to do so, transaction T only needs to put a V lock for $d=v_1$ on AJV. However, during this period, transaction T cannot use the first kind V value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B to do any update. This is because no entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index I_B, and transaction T cannot use the first kind V value lock for $d=v_1$ to insert an entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index I_B. Hence, there is no read-write conflict between transaction T and transaction T' on $d=v_1$. Also, if transaction T' itself inserts an

entry for value v_3 into the B-tree index I_B such that $v_1 \leq v_3 < v_2$, transaction T' will hold an X lock for $d=v_3$ on *AJV* (see how the second kind V and X value locks are implemented on the B-tree index in Section 7.2.1). Then transaction T still cannot get the second kind V (or X) value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B before transaction T' finishes execution. (If $v_1=v_3$, then transaction T cannot get the first kind V value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B before transaction T' finishes execution. If $v_1<v_3$, transaction T cannot use the first kind V value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B to do any update.)

(4) Case 4: No entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index I_B. Also, transaction T gets the first kind V (or second kind V, or X) value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B first.

In this case, there are three possible scenarios:

(a) Transaction T gets the first kind V value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B first. Hence, transaction T puts a V lock for $d=v_1$ on *AJV*. During the period that transaction T holds the V lock for $d=v_1$ on *AJV*, another transaction T'' can insert an entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index I_B. Note $T'' \neq T$, as transaction T cannot use a first kind V value lock for $d=v_1$ to insert an entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index I_B. Before transaction T'' inserts an entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index I_B, no entry for value v_1 exists in the B-tree index I_B, so transaction T cannot use the first kind V value lock for $d=v_1$ to do any update. Hence, there is no write-read conflict between transaction T and transaction T' on $d=v_1$. After transaction T'' inserts an entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index I_B, the entry for value v_1 cannot be physically deleted from the B-tree index I_B before transaction T releases the V lock for $d=v_1$ on *AJV*. Hence, during this period, transaction T' cannot get the S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B, since transaction T' cannot put an S lock for $d=v_1$ on *AJV*.

(b) Transaction T gets the second kind V value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B first. Hence, transaction T puts a V lock for $d=v_1$ and another V lock for $d=v_2$ on *AJV*. Also, transaction T inserts a new entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index I_B. Before transaction T inserts the new entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index I_B, transaction T holds the V lock and the latch for $d=v_2$ on *AJV*. During this period, no other transaction T'' can insert an entry for value v_3 into the B-tree index I_B such that $v_1 \leq v_3 < v_2$. This is because to do so, transaction T'' needs to get a latch (or X lock) for $d=v_2$ on *AJV*. Then during this period, transaction T' cannot get the S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B. This is because to do so, transaction T' needs to get an S lock for $d=v_2$ on *AJV*. After transaction T inserts the new entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index I_B, transaction T will hold a V lock for $d=v_1$ on *AJV* until transaction T finishes execution. Then during this period,

transaction T' still cannot get the S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B. This is because to do so, transaction T' needs to get an S lock for $d=v_1$ on *AJV*.

(c) Transaction T gets the X value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B first. Hence, transaction T puts an X lock for $d=v_1$ and another X lock for $d=v_2$ on *AJV*. During the period that transaction T holds the two X locks for $d=v_1$ and $d=v_2$ on *AJV*, no other transaction T'' can insert an entry for value v_3 into the B-tree index I_B such that $v_1 \leq v_3 < v_2$. This is because to do so, transaction T'' needs to get a V (or X) lock for $d=v_2$ on *AJV*. Then during the period that transaction T holds the two X locks for $d=v_1$ and $d=v_2$ on *AJV*, transaction T' cannot get the S value lock for $d=v_1$ on the B-tree index I_B. This is because to do so, depending on whether transaction T has inserted a new entry for value v_1 into the B-tree index I_B or not, transaction T' needs to get an S lock for either $d=v_1$ or $d=v_2$ on *AJV*.

In the above three scenarios, the situation that transaction T itself inserts an entry for value v_3 into the B-tree index I_B such that $v_1 \leq v_3 < v_2$ can be discussed in a way similar to Case 3.

Hence, for any value v_1, there is no read-write or write-read conflict between two different transactions on those tuples of the aggregate join view *AJV* whose attribute d has value v_1. As discussed at the beginning of this section, write-write conflicts do not exist and thus our key-range locking protocol guarantees serializability.

7.3 Applying the V locking Protocol to Non-aggregate Join Views with B-tree Indices

Implementing the V locking protocol for join views in the presence of B-tree indices is tricky. For example, suppose we do not use the latches in the latch pool. That is, we only use S, X, and V value locks on join views. Suppose we implement S, X, and V value locks for join views on B-tree indices in the same way as described in Section 7.2.1. Also, suppose a B-tree index is built on attribute a of a join view *JV*. Then to insert a new join result tuple t into the join view *JV*, we need to first put a V value lock for $t.a$ on the B-tree index. If no entry for $t.a$ exists in the B-tree index, we need to find the smallest value v_2 in the B-tree index such that $v_2 > t.a$ and put a V lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index. Unfortunately, this approach does not work. The reason is similar to what is shown for Technique 1 in Section 7.2.2. (We can replace the V lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index by an X lock. However, the X lock for value v_2 on the B-tree index cannot be downgraded to a V lock. Hence, this X lock greatly reduces concurrency.)

To implement value locks for join views on B-tree indices with high concurrency, we can utilize the latches in the latch pool and treat join views in the same way as aggregate join views. For join views, we still use four kinds of value locks: S, X, first kind V, and second kind V. For example, suppose a B-tree index is built on attribute a of a join view *JV*. As described in Section 7.2.1, to insert a new join result tuple t into the join view *JV*, we first put a second kind V value lock for $t.a$ on the B-tree index. To delete

a join result tuple *t* from the join view *JV*, we first put a first kind V value lock for *t.a* on the B-tree index. For join views, all the four different kinds of value locks (S, X, first kind V, and second kind V) can be implemented on B-tree indices in the same way as described in Section 7.2.1. The only exception is that we no longer need the latch on the group by attribute value of tuple *t*. The correctness (serializability) of the implementation can be proved in a way similar to that described in Section 7.2.3. Note here, for join views, the latches in the latch pool are used for a different purpose from that for aggregate join views.

[KMH97] M. Kornacker, C. Mohan, and J.M. Hellerstein. Concurrency and Recovery in Generalized Search Trees. SIGMOD Conf. 1997: 62-72.

[Lom93] D.B. Lomet. Key Range Locking Strategies for Improved Concurrency. VLDB 1993: 655-664.

[Moh90a] C. Mohan. ARIES/KVL: A Key-Value Locking Method for Concurrency Control of Multiaction Transactions Operating on B-Tree Indexes. VLDB 1990: 392-405.

[Moh90b] C. Mohan. Commit_LSN: A Novel and Simple Method for Reducing Locking and Latching in Transaction Processing Systems. VLDB 1990: 406-418.