

Fine-grained Transaction Scheduling in Replicated Databases via Symbolic Execution

Pedro Raminhas

pedro.raminhas@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

Stage: 2nd Year PhD Student

<u>Research Area</u>: Dependable and fault-tolerant systems and networks

Advisors: Miguel Matos

Paolo Romano



• <u>Problem</u>:

- Replication techniques incur non-negligible costs to maintain consistency among replicas
- 2PC => Distributed *Deadlocks*
- Classic SMR => Serial execution
- Parallel SMR => Not to trivial to parallelize txs and maintain consistency



• <u>Problem</u>:

- Replication techniques incur non-negligible costs to maintain consistency among replicas
- 2PC => Distributed *Deadlocks*
- Classic SMR => Serial execution
- Parallel SMR => Not to trivial to parallelize txs and maintain consistency

• Why is it a problem:

- Deadlocks
- Automatic Conflict Class Prediction => Too Coarse Grained => Level of the table => Low Throughput
- Manual Prediction => Hard and Not optimal
- Avoid False negatives => Rollback of Txs, possibly inconsistencies among replicas



• <u>Problem</u>:

- Replication techniques incur non-negligible costs to maintain consistency among replicas
- 2PC => Distributed *Deadlocks*
- Classic SMR => Serial execution
- Parallel SMR => Not to trivial to parallelize txs and maintain consistency

Why is it a problem:

- Deadlocks
- Automatic Conflict Class Prediction => Too Coarse Grained => Level of the table => Low Throughput
- Manual Prediction => Hard and Not optimal
- Avoid False negatives => Rollback of Txs, possibly inconsistencies among replicas

• <u>Approach</u>:

Symbolic Execution => Recurring to Symbolic Execution, we are able to provide in a *fine-grained* and *automatic* way the set of objects/tuples accessed in a transaction.

• <u>Problem</u>:

- Replication techniques incur non-negligible costs to maintain consistency among replicas
- 2PC => Distributed *Deadlocks*
- Classic SMR => Serial execution
- Parallel SMR => Not to trivial to parallelize txs and maintain consistency

Why is it a problem:

- Deadlocks
- Automatic Conflict Class Prediction => Too Coarse Grained => Level of the table => Low Throughput
- Manual Prediction => Hard and Not optimal
- Avoid False negatives => Rollback of Txs, possibly inconsistencies among replicas

• <u>Approach</u>:

Symbolic Execution => Recurring to Symbolic Execution, we are able to provide in a *fine-grained* and *automatic* way the set of objects/tuples accessed in a transaction.

<u>Consequences:</u>

- Better Parallelism
- No Runtime Overhead => offline analysis
- No False negatives
- Determinist Scheduling algorithms benefit from fine-grained information









- <u>Compile-Time</u>
 - SE gives the set of keys/tuples accessed



Tx A: Sum of USA's Sallary : Entire Table Employee's Countries && Bob



- <u>Compile-Time</u>
 - SE gives the set of keys/tuples accessed



Tx A: Sum of USA's Sallary : Entire Table Employee's Countries && Bob Tx B: Increase Alice Sallary : Alice



- <u>Compile-Time</u>
 - SE gives the set of keys/tuples accessed





• <u>Runtime</u>

• Use fine-grained information to Schedule Transactions





• <u>Runtime</u>

• Use fine-grained information to Schedule Transactions





Lock-based:

+ Simple

+ No runtime overhead

- Not trivial to parallelize lock table

Solver:

+ Provides the optimal
schedule for batch
- Imposes runtime
overhead



Thanks for the attention

