

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE
15-445/645 – DATABASE SYSTEMS (FALL 2018)
PROF. ANDY PAVLO

Homework 5 (by Tupac Shakur)
Due: **Monday Dec 3, 2018 @ 11:59pm**

IMPORTANT:

- **Upload this PDF** with your answers to **Gradescope by 11:59pm on Monday Dec 3, 2018.**
- **Plagiarism:** Homework may be discussed with other students, but all homework is to be completed **individually.**
- **You have to use this PDF for all of your answers.**

For your information:

- Graded out of **100** points; **3** questions total

Revision : 2018/11/23 22:56

| Question | Points | Score |
|-------------------|--------|-------|
| Two-Phase Commit | 40 | |
| Distributed Joins | 25 | |
| Replication | 35 | |
| Total: | 100 | |

Question 1: Two-Phase Commit.....[40 points]

Consider a distributed transaction T operating under the two-phase commit protocol. Let N_0 be the *coordinator* node, and N_1, N_2, N_3 be the *participant* nodes.

The following messages have been sent:

| time | message |
|------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | N_0 to N_1 : “Phase1:PREPARE” |
| 2 | N_0 to N_2 : “Phase1:PREPARE” |
| 3 | N_0 to N_3 : “Phase1:PREPARE” |
| 4 | N_2 to N_0 : “OK” |
| 5 | N_1 to N_0 : “OK” |

Figure 1: Two-Phase Commit messages for transaction T

- (a) [10 points] Who should send a message next at time 6 in Figure 1? Select *all* the possible answers.
- N_0
 - N_1
 - N_2
 - N_3
 - It is not possible to determine
- (b) [10 points] To whom? Again, select *all* the possible answers.
- N_0
 - N_1
 - N_2
 - N_3
 - It is not possible to determine
- (c) [10 points] Suppose that N_0 never received the “OK” response from N_1 at time 5 in Figure 1 (the message got dropped due to a hardware failure). Instead, N_0 “times out” after waiting a certain amount of time. What should happen under the two-phase commit protocol in this scenario?
- N_0 resends “Phase1:PREPARE” to N_1
 - N_0 resends “Phase1:PREPARE” to all of the participant nodes
 - N_0 sends “ABORT” to N_1
 - N_0 sends “ABORT” all of the participant nodes
 - N_0 sends “Phase2:COMMIT” all of the participant nodes
 - N_1 resends “OK” to N_0
 - It is not possible to determine

- (d) **[10 points]** Suppose that N_0 successfully receives all of the “OK” messages from the participants from the first phase (i.e., after time 6 in Figure 1). It then sends the “Phase2:COMMIT” message to all of the participants at time 7 but N_2 crashes before it receives this message. What is the status of the transaction T when N_2 comes back on-line?
- T 's status is *committed*
 - T 's status is *aborted*
 - It is not possible to determine

Question 2: Distributed Joins [25 points]

Answer the following questions about performing joins in a distributed database. You can assume that the DBMS uses a shared-nothing architecture.

| A | B | C |
|----|----|----|
| a1 | b2 | c3 |
| a4 | b5 | c6 |
| a1 | b2 | c4 |
| a5 | b3 | c2 |
| a8 | b9 | c7 |

| C | D | E |
|----|----|----|
| c1 | d4 | e1 |
| c2 | d3 | e2 |
| c3 | d4 | e5 |
| c1 | d2 | e3 |
| c3 | d6 | e8 |

(a) $R(A, B, C)$ (b) $S(C, D, E)$

Table 1: Sample database

(a) Consider the relations $R(A, B, C)$ and $S(C, D, E)$ shown in Table 1, where attribute $S.C$ is a foreign key of attribute $R.C$.

i. [10 points] What is the output of $R \times S$?

- { (a4,b5,c3), (a4,b5,c3), (a3,b2,c3) }
- { (a5,b3,c2), (c2,d3,e2), (a1,b2,c3), (c3,d4,e5), (c3,d6,e8) }
- { (c2,b3,a5), (c2,d3,e2), (c3,d4,e5), (c3,d6,e8) }
- { (a1,b2), (a4,b5) }
- { (a5,b3,c2), (a1,b2,c3) }
- { (a5,b2,c3), (a1,b2,c3), (a5,b3,c2) }
- None of the above

ii. [10 points] What is the output of $S \times R$?

- { (c3,d6,e8), (c3,d4,e5), (c2,d3,e2) }
- { (c2,d3,e2), (a1,b2,c3), (c3,d6,e8), (c3,d4,e5), (a5,b3,c2) }
- { (c1,d4,e1), (c2,d3,e2), (c1,d2,e3) }
- { (c2,d3,e2), (c1,d4,e1), (c3,d6,e8), (c1,d2,e3), (c3,d4,e5) }
- { (d3,e2), (d6,e8) }
- { (c2,d3,e2), (c3,d6,e8) }
- None of the above

- (b) **[5 points]** In general, is the semijoin operation symmetric for every possible database? That is, is the following equation always true for any possible relations $R1$ and $R2$?

$$R1 \bowtie R2 \stackrel{?}{=} R2 \bowtie R1 \quad (1)$$

- Yes
- No
- It is not possible to determine

Question 3: Replication.....[35 points]

Consider a DBMS using active-passive, master-replica replication with multi-versioned concurrency control. All read-write transactions go to the master node (NODE A), while read-only transactions are routed to the replica (NODE B). You can assume that the DBMS has “instant” fail-over and master elections. That is, there is no time gap between when the master goes down and when the replica gets promoted as the new master. For example, if NODE A goes down at timestamp ① then NODE B will be elected the new master at ②. Note that this is not a realistic assumption but we’re using it to simplify the problem setup.

The database has a single table `foo(id, val)` with the following tuples:

| id | val |
|----|-----|
| 1 | aaa |
| 2 | bbb |

Table 2: `foo(id, val)`

For each questions listed below, assume that the following transactions shown in Figure 2 are executing in the DBMS: (1) Transaction #1 on NODE A and (2) Transaction #2 on NODE B. You can assume that the timestamps for each operation is the real physical time of when it was invoked at the DBMS and that the clocks on both nodes are perfectly synchronized (again, this is not a realistic assumption).

| time | operation | time | operation |
|------|--|------|-----------------------------------|
| ① | BEGIN; | ② | BEGIN READ ONLY; |
| ② | UPDATE foo SET val = 'xxx'; | ③ | SELECT val FROM foo WHERE id = 1; |
| ③ | UPDATE foo SET val = 'yyy' WHERE id = 1; | ④ | SELECT val FROM foo WHERE id = 2; |
| ④ | UPDATE foo SET val = 'zzz' WHERE id = 2; | ⑤ | SELECT val FROM foo WHERE id = 2; |
| ⑤ | COMMIT; | ⑥ | COMMIT; |

(a) Transaction #1 – NODE A

(b) Transaction #2 – NODE B

Figure 2: Transactions executing in the DBMS.

- (a) Assume that the DBMS is using *asynchronous* replication with *continuous* log streaming (i.e., the master node sends log records to the replica in the background after the transaction executes them). Suppose that NODE A crashes at timestamp ④ before it executes the third UPDATE operation.

- i. **[10 points]** If Transaction #2 is running under SNAPSHOT ISOLATION, what is the return result of the `val` attribute for its SELECT query at timestamp ③? Select all that are possible.
- aaa
 - xxx
 - yyy
 - None of the above

ii. [10 points] If Transaction #2 is running under the READ UNCOMMITTED isolation level, what is the return result of the val attribute for its SELECT query at timestamp ④? Select all that are possible.

- bbb
- xxx
- zzz
- None of the above

(b) [15 points] Assume that the DBMS is using *semi-synchronous* replication with *continuous* log streaming. Suppose that both NODE A and NODE B crash at exactly the same time at timestamp ⑥ after executing Transaction #1's COMMIT operation. You can assume that the application was notified that the Transaction #1 was committed successfully.

After the crash, you find that NODE A had a major hardware failure and cannot boot. NODE B is able to recover and is elected the new master.

What are the values of the tuples in the database when the system comes back online? Select all that are possible.

- { (1,aaa), (2,bbb) }
- { (1,xxx), (2,bbb) }
- { (1,xxx), (2,xxx) }
- { (1,yyy), (2,bbb) }
- { (1,yyy), (2,xxx) }
- { (1,yyy), (2,zzz) }
- None of the above