

Path-Sensitive Atomic Commit: Local Coordination Avoidance for Distributed Transactions (Technical Report)

TIM SOETHOUT, ING Bank and Centrum Wiskunde & Informatica, The Netherlands

TIJS VAN DER STORM, Centrum Wiskunde & Informatica and University of Groningen, The Netherlands

JURGEN VINJU, Centrum Wiskunde & Informatica and Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

Concurrent objects with asynchronous messaging are an increasingly popular way to structure highly available, high performance, large-scale software systems. To ensure data-consistency and support synchronization between objects such systems often use an atomic commitment protocol such as Two-Phase commit (2PC). In highly available, high-throughput systems, such as large banking infrastructure, however, 2PC becomes a bottleneck when objects are highly congested (one object queuing a lot of messages at the same time because of locking). In this paper we introduce Path-Sensitive Atomic Commit (PSAC) to address this situation. We start from message handlers (or methods), which are decorated with pre- and postconditions, describing their guards and effect. This allows the PSAC lock mechanism to check whether the effect of two incoming messages at the same time are independent, and to avoid locking if this is the case. As a result, more messages are directly accepted or rejected, and higher overall throughput is obtained.

We have implemented PSAC for a state machine-based DSL called Rebel, on top of a runtime based on the Akka actor framework. Our performance evaluation shows that PSAC exhibits the same scalability and latency characteristics as standard 2PC, but obtains up to 1.8 times median higher throughput in congested scenarios.

1 INTRODUCTION

Structuring a software system as a collection of communicating objects is an increasingly popular architecture for large-scale, high performance, and high availability IT infrastructure. For instance, the Scala Akka actor framework allows concurrent entities to be modeled as actor objects which communicate through (asynchronous) messaging [Akka 2018]. A common challenge in such systems is to maintain high-availability and performance when communicating objects need to synchronize. This is particularly challenging in the context of large, scalable, highly available enterprise software. For instance, banks like ING Bank¹ have to deal with large and complex IT landscapes, consisting of many communicating software applications and components, under very high transaction loads.

A safe and well-known approach to implement such synchronization is Two-Phase Commit (2PC) [Gray 1978]. While this approach is consistent and serializable, it is not strictly available, since participants in a 2PC-transaction are blocked for other transactions. In this paper we study the performance of high load 2PC and introduce a novel concurrency mechanism named Path-Sensitive Atomic Commit (PSAC), which minimizes waiting in busy entities by exploiting high-level, functional knowledge about object behavior.

PSAC trades computing power for reduced waiting on locks, in order to achieve higher throughput than standard 2PC. By detecting whether two or more incoming requests have independent effects – that is, if the success or abort of any of the requests does not influence the final result of the others – PSAC can start processing more requests in parallel than 2PC.

We have implemented PSAC in the context of Rebel, a state machine-based domain-specific language (DSL) for the specification of high-level business objects in the financial domain [Stoel et al. 2016]. Rebel supports the unambiguous specification, simulation, verification, testing, and execution of financial products like saving accounts, mortgages etc. Rebel specifications can be turned into working software through code generation.

¹<https://www.ing.com>

A key feature of Rebel is that objects are modeled as state machines which respond to events and that these events are decorated with pre- and post-conditions describing their applicability and state effect, respectively. Separating the functional specification of business objects from the way they are implemented allows experimenting with different back-ends. In this case we have developed a code generator mapping Rebel specifications to an implementation based on the Akka actor framework, employing either 2PC or PSAC. The PSAC backend then exploits the Rebel event preconditions and postconditions to detect independence of messages.

Based on these two implementations we evaluate the performance of PSAC, and compare it to the standard 2PC performance in the same scenario. Our results show that PSAC consistently outperforms 2PC in high-congestion scenarios. Furthermore, PSAC retains the same scalability characteristics as 2PC.

The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce PSAC, a novel concurrency mechanism that exploits domain-knowledge to allow transactions to proceed in parallel if it can be detected that their effects are independent (section 2).
- We describe the implementation of PSAC based on Rebel, targeting the Akka actor framework, which provides the basis for our experimental setup (section 3).
- We evaluate the performance of both 2PC and PSAC, and show that PSAC outperforms 2PC in high congestion scenarios (section 4).

The paper is concluded with a discussion of related work and further directions for research (section 5) and a conclusion (section 6).

2 PATH-SENSITIVE ATOMIC COMMIT (PSAC)

2.1 Context

In order to ensure serializable transactions, the atomic commit protocol two-phase commit [Bernstein et al. 1987; Gray 1978; Özsu and Valduriez 2011] (2PC) locks all involved participants of a transaction. This prevents other transactions from executing concurrently on that participant and makes sure that no transaction can make the state invalid. This solution avoids race conditions and therefore keeps the data consistent. For some participants, however, this might be more conservative than needed, since some transactions might succeed irrespective of the success or failure of another one.

A 2PC transaction consists of a single transaction coordinator and one or more transaction participants. The coordinator and participants follow a state machine definition that describes if they are waiting, committed or aborted. Their internal state is persisted to a durable log, and thus can be recovered in case of failure. The coordinator asks the participants to vote for specific actions. If it receives a YES vote from all participants, it will tell them to commit the decision and apply the action. If at least one participant votes NO the transaction is aborted by the transaction coordinator and no actions are applied. 2PC is considered blocking, because if the coordinator fails in the specific case when participants have voted, but not yet received a commit decision by the coordinator, the participants are blocked until the coordinator recovers.

2PC locks the object even though a new incoming transaction might be compatible with the current in-progress transaction, and coordination between the two actions is not actually necessary. This depends on the functional application requirements. It could be less strict while still maintaining serializability.

For example, given a bank account object with withdrawal and deposit methods, where a withdrawal should never make an account balance negative. Consider a bank transaction with two bank accounts as transaction participants. One where money is withdrawn, and the other deposited.

The latter account is locked and it has to wait until the first deposit action is completed before accepting new actions. In 2PC it is the case that if another deposit action for this account arrives, it has to wait. An alternative is to use the available knowledge to determine that the outcome of the first deposit can never interfere with the acceptance of the second deposit, so it can be already started, without violating consistency of the balance with respect to its specification.

In this section we present Path-Sensitive Atomic Commit (PSAC), which exploits specific knowledge about preconditions and post-effects to remove unnecessary locking, and thus increases performance of the overall system in terms of throughput and availability. Intuitively PSAC, like 2PC, is a blocking access gate to an object, but instead of the opaque “busy” indicator of 2PC, PSAC filters incoming transactions which would interact with concurrent transactions while leaving independent transactions through. The strictness of the gate is determined at run time on the incoming action and possible outcomes of in-progress actions by using the post-effects to determine the outcomes and the preconditions to validate the incoming actions against them. PSAC gives the same serializability guarantees as 2PC, while allowing higher throughput when no local coordination is needed. Functional correctness in the local participant is maintained and actions’ effects are applied in the original order of arrival. In the context of the example: PSAC would allow both deposits message to start processing because neither of them would affect the success or failure of the other one.

PSAC is faster in accepting actions and increases parallelism when possible, and falls back to the safe 2PC locking approach when not enough information is available. In practice, we limit the number of allowed in-progress transactions to be sure that the system can make progress and is not overflowed with accepting new actions on entities. As a consequence, when limiting the maximum number of parallel transactions to 1, PSAC degrades gracefully to standard 2PC, since new actions are delayed until the single in-progress action finishes.

PSAC only performs better than 2PC in the case of high-contention and higher scale. If there is only a single action in progress per participant, we will not see much difference compared to 2PC, since 2PC also allows the single action. We confirm this expectation in the experimental results of the NoSync experiment in subsection 4.4.

In a scenario with many participants and many requests, but in different transactions (low contention), an application using 2PC (or PSAC) is embarrassingly parallel. This means that each of the participants can do their own computations without the need to synchronize with others. These kinds of computations are more easily spread over multiple application nodes.

PSAC’s performance gain becomes evident when multiple actions on the same participant are requested around the same moment in time. The ability to do parallel processing when the application requirements allow it, results in less waiting, and thus more throughput. It also results in being able to process actions that would otherwise have timed out. We see this benefit clearly at a higher request rate, especially in a higher contention use case, where for example a single or few participants are required to participate for the rest of the system to make progress.

On the other hand, there is also an upper bound to the performance improvement of PSAC over 2PC. If the servers running this application are already maxed out on one or more resources, such as CPU, memory or network bandwidth, we expect less improvement, because PSAC can no longer trade the extra CPU cycles for extra precondition computations and the extra parallel transactions. In the high-contention use-case with a high number of requests, 2PC waits most of the time on locks to clear and many resources are underused. This is where the biggest performance gain is for PSAC.




Fig. 1. Vanilla Two-Phase Commit




Fig. 2. Path-Sensitive Atomic Commit

2.2 PSAC in action

Figure 1 and Figure 2 visualize the general difference between 2PC and PSAC when two actions arrive at the same object in a small time frame. Figure 1, on the left, shows the sequence of events when using 2PC to synchronize. Consider an account object instance with balance €100 and a precondition check on the withdrawal action that prohibits a negative balance after withdrawal. Time flows downwards. When a withdrawal action (-€30) arrives (1), its preconditions are checked against the current balance. The action -€30 is allowed and a new 2PC-transaction starts for this action. This locks the object, in order to guarantee serializability. Even though the account allows the transaction, it is not yet known if the transaction will be committed or aborted by the coordinator, due to processing in other transaction participants. Then another withdrawal action (-€50) arrives

(2). Because the account object is locked, the action is delayed. When $-\text{€}30$ commits (3), its effects are applied to the account state, resulting in a new balance of $\text{€}70$ and the object is unlocked. Now, the delayed withdrawal ($-\text{€}50$) can start, eventually it commits (4) and its effect is applied. This results in the new state of $\text{€}20$. 2PC effectively serializes the two parallel transactions.

The amount of locking performed by 2PC can be problematic in situations where a lot of transactions happen on a single object. For instance, in the case of ING Bank, when the Dutch tax authority pays out benefits to citizens, ING is required to handle all these transactions within a specific time frame. The tax authority's bank account is highly congested because it is involved with all individual transfers. This would not scale on such an object-oriented message-based distributed system, because each payout will have to wait on the previous to finish.

PSAC improves on this situation by detecting at run time if transactions can be processed in parallel anyway. The same execution scenario is visualized in Figure 2, illustrating how PSAC differs from 2PC. We again consider an account object with current state $\text{€}100$ and a precondition check that prohibits negative balance. Similar to 2PC, when a withdrawal action ($-\text{€}30$) arrives (1) and no other transactions are in progress, a new 2PC-transaction is started, but contrary to 2PC, the object is not completely blocked. When another withdrawal action ($-\text{€}50$) arrives (2), it is started because it is independent of whether the earlier action commits or aborts, since there is enough balance to allow the withdrawal to proceed in either case. Therefore, the $-\text{€}50$ transaction is immediately started. PSAC can detect this independence, based on in-depth knowledge of the functionality of a bank account via the preconditions and post-effects of its transactions.

In the example scenario, $-\text{€}50$ commits (3) earlier than $-\text{€}30$, but its effect is delayed to maintain serializability. The requester can be already notified of the successful result (Done $-\text{€}50$), but not yet the new state of the account, since this is dependent on the outcome of $-\text{€}30$. Now, when $-\text{€}30$ commits (4), we apply both effects in order to the account, resulting in a new state of $\text{€}20$.

In situations with non-uniform loads, PSAC delivers on a higher availability of transactions than 2PC (and thus higher scalability in terms of throughput), at the one-time static cost of fully specifying preconditions and actions' effects for every transaction. We detail the algorithm below and evaluate these claims in section 4.

2.3 PSAC Algorithm

Figure 3 shows the PSAC algorithm in pseudo-code. The algorithm maintains three lists, *inProgress* containing transactions that have been started, but have not finished yet; *delayed*, containing the transactions that have to wait till at least one of the in-progress transactions completes; and finally *queued*, containing the transactions that are successful, but not yet applied to the state of the object, to maintain original order.

On arrival of a command C_{new} , its preconditions are checked against all possible outcomes of the transactions that are currently in progress. If it is allowed in all possible states, the action is independent and can start processing. For such transactions it is as if the account is always available and nothing is locked. If there is no possible outcome where the preconditions of C_{new} hold, the action is immediately rejected with a failure reply. If there is at least one possible state where the preconditions of C_{new} hold, the action is dependent on one of the transactions that is currently in progress, so it is delayed by adding it to *delayed*. For such a transaction, the semantics of PSAC is equal to 2PC.

Whenever an action commits, it is queued for applying the effects to the actor state. Since all actions are stored in order of arrival in *inProgress*, it will be applied to the state in the same order. This way non-commutative actions do not violate linearizability. If a transaction aborts, the requester is notified of the failure, and it is removed from the *inProgress* list. Finally, if the first element of *inProgress* is in *queued*, its effects are applied to the actor state, it is removed from

```

inProgress = []
delayed = []
queued = []

while true:
  if incoming command  $C_{new}$ :
    # See Figure 4 for this part of the algorithm.
     $S = \text{set}$  of all possible outcomes of  $C_i \in \text{inProgress}$ 
    if  $\forall s \in S$  preconditions of  $C_{new}$  hold:
      inProgress +=  $C_{new}$ 
      start  $C_{new}$ 
    else if  $\neg \exists s \in S$  such that preconditions of  $C_{new}$  hold:
      reply Fail( $C_{new}$ ) to requester of  $C_{new}$ 
    else
      delayed +=  $C_{new}$ 

  else if commit of  $C_n$ :
    reply Success( $C_n$ ) to requester of  $C_n$ 
    queued +=  $C_n$ 

  else if abort of  $C_n$ :
    reply Fail( $C_n$ ) to requester of  $C_n$ 
    inProgress -=  $C_n$ 

 $C_m = \text{head}(\text{inProgress})$ 
if  $C_m \in \text{queued}$ :
  apply  $C_m$ 
  inProgress -=  $C_m$ 
  queued -=  $C_m$ 
  currentDelayed = delayed
  delayed = []
for  $C_i$  in currentDelayed:
  handle  $C_i$  as incoming command

```

Fig. 3. Pseudo-code of a PSAC-enabled actor

inProgress and queued, and all delayed actions are retried. This results in applying the effects in initial incoming order and making sure delayed actions are retried as soon as possible.

The key idea of the algorithm is the use of the preconditions and actions' effects to construct a tree of all possible outcomes of the set of transactions that are currently in progress. At run time, given the current object state, the set of in-progress actions and the new incoming action, we calculate all possible outcome states of the in-progress actions using the post-actions. This is done by simulating the first in-progress action in the current state, branching into two possible outcomes: one where the in-progress action actually commits and the post-action is applied, and one where it is aborted and thus not applied. Doing this for all in-progress actions results in a tree with in its leaves the possible outcome states of the object.

Figure 4 shows an example of the potential outcome tree S corresponding to the scenario of Figure 2 and how it is updated when events arrive. The leaves represent the potential outcomes. The diagram can be read as follows:




Fig. 4. PSAC example with internal possible outcome tree and decisions on commands.

- (1) C_1 Withdraw $-\text{€}30$ arrives; preconditions are valid for C_1 , and given tentative Abort (-) or Commit (+) by the 2PC transaction, the possible outcome tree branches to two possible outcomes: S_0 and S_{0+1} , respectively corresponding to a balance of $\text{€}100$ and $\text{€}70$.
- (2) C_2 Withdraw $-\text{€}50$ arrives; preconditions are valid for C_2 in all possible outcomes S_0 and S_{0+1} ; both possible outcomes branch in similar fashion.
- (3) C_3 Withdraw $-\text{€}60$ arrives; preconditions are *not* valid in all possible states, in particular not in S_{0+2} and S_{0+1+2} : C_3 is delayed until is independent from the in-progress actions. In this case C_3 is only dependent on C_2 . The outcome tree is unchanged, since C_3 is not accepted for processing yet.
- (4) C_2 is committed by the 2PC coordinator; the possible outcome tree is pruned, because the branches where C_2 is aborted are no longer valid, resulting in S_{0+2}
- (5) After an in-progress action commits or aborts, in this case, C_2 , delayed actions are retried, in this case C_3 . Now preconditions fail in all possible outcome states, thus C_3 is independent and fails.
- (6) When C_1 commits, the possible outcome tree is pruned again and a single state S_{0+1+2} remains. The new state is now calculated by applying the effects in order.

Given all possible outcome states we can check the new incoming action against all outcomes using its precondition. This gives insight if the action conflicts with any in-progress action or combinations thereof. If all or none of possible outcomes satisfy the preconditions, the incoming action is independent and is accepted for processing or immediately rejected.

A difference from 2PC is that actions that come in later could finish earlier. In this case the effect of the action is delayed until after the previous actions are committed or aborted, making sure that serializability is maintained.

3 IMPLEMENTATION: REBEL AND AKKA

To compare PSAC to 2PC in a realistic environment, we prototyped a small accounting service on top of Akka. For the pre- and postconditions of transactions we use the Rebel specification language. Our specific use of Rebel and Akka are not essential to the operation of PSAC but they are part of our evaluation setup for the performance evaluation in section 4.

3.1 Rebel: a DSL for Financial Products

Rebel is a DSL for describing financial products, designed in collaboration with ING Bank, as an experiment to tame the complexity of large financial IT landscapes [Stoel et al. 2016]. Declarative specifications functionally describe financial products, such as current- and savings accounts and transactions between them. Rebel specifications are designed to facilitate unambiguous communication with domain experts, support simulation, verification, testing, and execution through code generation.

We use a simple example Rebel-like specification, shown in Figure 5. A specification declares an identity (using the annotation `@identity`), data fields, life cycle of a product as a state machine with actions and pre- and postconditions.

Figure 5 shows the specification of two classes, `Account` and `Transaction`. An `Account` is identified by its IBAN bank account number, and has a current balance. The life cycle of an account is as follows: it can be opened, then any number of withdrawals and deposits may occur, and finally it can be closed. Transitions among states are triggered by the actions `Open`, `Withdraw`, `Deposit`, and `Close` respectively. Each event is guarded by preconditions and describes its effect in terms of postconditions. For instance, the `Withdraw` action requires that the withdrawn amount is greater than zero, and that the withdrawal does not produce a negative balance. The effect of withdrawal is then specified as a post-condition on the balance of this account.

The second class `Transaction` in Figure 5 models a transfer of money between two accounts. It can simply be booked via the `Book` action. The `Book` action is triggered on two accounts. The effect of booking a transaction consists of *synchronizing* the `Withdraw` event on the `from` account, with the `Deposit` event on the `to` account. The `sync` represents an atomic transaction between two or more entities. In other words, an underlying implementation must guarantee that either both `Withdraw` and `Deposit` should fail or both should succeed.

The fact that the functional requirements on financial products are formally specified in Rebel separates the “what” from the “how”. In other words, decoupling the description of a financial product from its implementation platform allows us to experiment with different back-ends for Rebel specifications, by developing different code generators for different platforms or different run-time architectures. Below we show how Rebel classes are mapped to Scala traits that can be executed as actors on the Akka platform. In particular this allows us to experiment with different implementations of the `sync` construct.

3.2 Executing Rebel on Akka

3.2.1 Deployment. To support fault tolerance and scalability, the execution of Rebel entities is deployed on at least two servers so that customer requests can still be processed when one of the servers breaks down. This means the generated application is a distributed system. One style of implementing a distributed system is by using the actor model [Hewitt et al. 1973]. Akka [Akka 2018] is a well-known toolbox for actor-based systems that runs on the JVM and is widely used to

```

class Account
  accountNumber: Iban @identity
  balance: Money

  initial init
    on Open(initialDeposit: Money): opened
      pre: initialDeposit ≥ €0
      post: this.balance ≡ initialDeposit

  opened
    on Withdraw(amount: Money): opened
      pre: amount > €0, balance - amount ≥ €0
      post: this.balance ≡ balance - amount
    on Deposit(amount: Money): opened
      pre: amount > €0
      post: this.balance ≡ balance + amount
    on Close(): closed

  final closed

```

```

class Transaction
  initial init
    on Book(amount: Money, to: Account, from: Account): booked
      sync:
        from.Withdraw(amount)
        to.Deposit(amount)
  final booked

```

Fig. 5. Rebel specification of a simple bank account: an `Account` supports events `Open`, `Withdraw`, `Deposit`, and `Close`. A `Transaction` can be booked by synchronizing `Withdraw` and `Deposit` on two accounts.

build distributed, message-driven applications. Mapping Rebel objects to Akka actors is a natural fit and provides sufficient low level controls to vary the implementation of the `sync` construct. This implementation approach is similar to other reactive architectures such presented by Debski et al. [Debski et al. 2018].

Amdahl’s Law [Amdahl 1967] tells us that the scalability of the application is directly proportional to the sequential part of the application. Fewer sequential parts mean better scalability potential. As much of the program as possible should be parallelizable. However, practical performance gains are also dependent on overhead of spawning, executing, and tearing down actors to be small enough to amortize in the overhead. Actors allow us to us to run each Rebel class instance in parallel and distribute the computation over multiple cluster nodes.

Class instance actors are automatically spread over multiple cluster nodes to allow for more optimal usage of resources such as RAM and CPU. This enables scaling in and out by moving the actors to other nodes if needed. Each actor runs as an independent object, so it performs work without having to wait on other actors, allowing concurrent work by the actors. In theory this means that actor systems could scale out horizontally, until they have to synchronize. In practice this means that an actor system scales until too many of its actors are locked in transactions at the same time too often.

```

trait AccountLogic extends RebelSpec[AccountState, AccountData, AccountCommand] {
  val initialState: AccountState      = Init
  val allStates  : Set[AccountState] = Set(Blocked, Closed, Init, Opened)
  val finalStates : Set[AccountState] = Set(Closed)

  def nextState: PartialFunction[(AccountState, Command), AccountState] = {
    case (Uninit, _: Open)      => Opened
    case (Opened, _: Withdraw) => Opened
    case (Opened, _: Deposit)  => Opened
    case (Opened, _: Close)    => Closed
  }

  def checkPre(data: AccountData, now: DateTime): PartialFunction[AccountCommand, CheckResult] = {
    case OpenAccount(accountNumber, initialDeposit) =>
      checkPreCondition(initialDeposit ≥ EUR(50.00))
    case Close() =>
      checkPreCondition(data.get.balance.get == EUR(0.00))
    case Withdraw(amount) =>
      checkPre(amount > EUR(0.00)) combine
      checkPre(data.get.balance.get - amount ≥ EUR(0.00))
    case Deposit(amount) =>
      checkPreCondition((amount > EUR(0.00)))
  }

  def apply(data: AccountData): PartialFunction[AccountCommand, AccountData] = {
    case OpenAccount(accountNumber, initialDeposit) =>
      Initialized(AccountData(accountNumber = Some(accountNumber), balance = Some(initialDeposit)))
    case Withdraw(amount) =>
      data.map(r => r.copy(balance = r.balance.map(_ - amount)))
    case Deposit(amount) =>
      data.map(r => r.copy(balance = r.balance.map(_ + amount)))
  }

  def checkPost(data: AccountData, now: DateTime, next: AccountData)
    : PartialFunction[AccountCommand, CheckResult] = { ... }

  def syncOps(data: RData): PartialFunction[AccountCommand, Set[SyncOp]] = Set.empty
}

class AccountActor extends RebelFSMACTOR[Account.type] with AccountLogic

```

Fig. 6. Generated Scala code for the Rebel Account entity (slightly simplified)

3.2.2 *Rebel to Akka*. Each instance or entity of a Rebel state machine is implemented as an actor. We use the following features of Akka: CLUSTER for cluster management and communication between application nodes; SHARDING for distributing actors over the cluster by sharding on the identity; PERSISTENCE enables event sourcing for durable storage and recovery; and HTTP for HTTP endpoints definitions and connection management. These combined Akka features allow us to spread the Rebel instance actors over a dynamically sized cluster of application nodes. The back-end

```

def syncOps(data: RData): PartialFunction[TransactionCommand, Set[SyncOp]] = {
  case Book(amount, from, to) => Set(
    SyncAction(ContactPoint(Account, from), Withdraw(amount)),
    SyncAction(ContactPoint(Account, to), Deposit(amount))
  )
}

```

Fig. 7. Generated code corresponding to the SYNC action in the Transaction entity using 2PC

for persistence is an append-only event sourcing log, for which we use the distributed and linearly scalable Cassandra database.

The library using Akka expects the Rebel specifications to implement a Scala trait `RebelSpec`. A simplified version of the Scala code generated from the Account example of Figure 5 is shown in Figure 6.

The algebraic data types `AccountState` and `AccountCommand` model respectively the Rebel state machine states and actions with child Scala case objects for the states and child case classes with the action fields. The methods `initialState`, `allStates`, and `finalStates` encode metadata of the life cycle of an entity. The method `nextState` encodes how transitions are performed and via which events. The preconditions and actions' effects required for PSAC are known from the Rebel specification and generated into the actor code. Preconditions are checked for each incoming action in the method `checkPre`. As a result, the method `apply` calculates the new state of the account given the current state and action.

An additional method `checkPost` is used to check the validity of the postconditions (elided for brevity). Finally, the `syncOps` method returns a set of operations between entities that must be synchronized as per the `sync` construct. Since the Account class requires no synchronization it returns the empty set.

The `RebelSpec` is made instantiable for the Akka run time system by creating a concrete actor class `AccountActor`, with a base class `RebelFSMACTOR` with marker trait `Account.type` where the `AccountLogic` is mixed in.

The Rebel library contains a restful HTTP API which derives endpoints for all the specifications and actions. These are used to trigger actions on the entities.

The translation of the Transaction class follows the same pattern. However, in this case the method `syncOps` does not return the empty set. It is shown in Figure 7. Each SYNC action is translated to a `SyncAction` with a `ContactPoint`, which enables sending messages to the SYNC participant living somewhere in the cluster, and the action on the SYNC participant itself.

3.2.3 Synchronization. We first consider the 2PC locking strategy. Our implementation follows the description by Tanenbaum and Van Steen [Tanenbaum and van Steen 2007] and is improved with optimizations found in [Weikum and Vossen 2002]. There is a single transaction manager or coordinator and one or more transaction participants, respectively implemented by Akka Persistent FSMs named `TransactionManager` and `TransactionParticipant`. This means that both define a state machine following the definition and also persist their state to the persistence back-end, and thus can be recovered in case of failure. The Akka Persistence event sourcing log implements the durable log.

Both manager and participants have timeouts on their initial states, this means that when no initialization message is received within a given time duration, they will timeout and abort the transaction. This makes sure that the system does not deadlock, although it might result in overhead in creation of transaction actors and messaging when lots of timeouts are triggered.

To make sure no deadlocks happen in other states, timeouts are in place that trigger retries and eventually stop the actor. In the unlikely case that a participant or coordinator is not running, the combination of Akka Sharding and Persistence will make sure it is restarted. This also works when some of the cluster nodes shut down, are killed, or become unreachable for whatever reason; in that case other nodes will take over automatically², restore the actors and continue the protocol.

PSAC is implemented on top of this. Whenever a new action is received by the actor, an action decider function is called. If the configurable maximum number of parallel transactions per actor is reached, the action is queued. Otherwise, it calculates the possible outcome states by iterating all the possible in-progress actions interleavings and checking the preconditions in the calculated states to decide if it can safely start the 2PC transaction for this action. If independency is detected, the action is also delayed. Note that reducing the maximum number of parallel transactions to 1 results in vanilla 2PC behavior.

4 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

4.1 Research Objectives

In this section, we evaluate the performance of PSAC relative to 2PC. First, we want to know for which scenarios 2PC is sufficient as a Rebel synchronization back-end and for which scenarios it can no longer maintain sufficient performance. Furthermore, we are interested in determining when PSAC performs better for the cases where 2PC is no longer sufficient. In order to look at applications that can scale with business requirements, we focus on scalable and resilient applications that can continue to grow when performance demands keep growing. We study applications that can scale over multiple servers.

We focus on A/B testing PSAC and 2PC for a fair comparison. Both are compared against each other in the same realistic synthetic scenarios with same load and configuration. We are interested in the scalability of both 2PC and PSAC under similar loads. In other words, we are interested in to what extent the throughput increases when more nodes are added to the Akka cluster.

It might seem counter-intuitive that the extra work in PSAC of calculating the possible outcomes tree and checking the preconditions against all of these states, can result in higher performance compared to 2PC. For an ideally-scheduled batch based system all extra calculations would worsen performance, since every CPU cycle counts. In this case, the most time in 2PC is lost by waiting for the unlock. PSAC's parallel transactions use this otherwise lost time in between for these extra calculations, to determine safe extra parallelization.

We expect that:

Hypothesis 1. 2PC and PSAC perform similarly in maximum sustainable throughput for actions without synchronization, because instances do not have to wait on each other.

Hypothesis 2. 2PC and PSAC perform similarly in maximum sustainable throughput for actions with low contention synchronization, because synchronization is evenly spread over the instances.

Hypothesis 3. PSAC performs better than 2PC in maximum sustainable throughput for actions with high contention synchronization, because 2PC has to block for in-progress actions, where PSAC allows multiple parallel transactions.

To be sure that we are not running into the limits of (configuring) the infrastructure, but really into limits of the synchronization implementation, we investigate first how far we can take the Akka infrastructure without any logic or synchronization.

Hypothesis 0. The actor system infrastructure enables horizontal scalability.

²The fundamental problem of determining when to fail over, because node failure, slowness and network delay are unrecognizable, is out of scope for this paper.

4.2 Deployment Setup




Fig. 8. Experiment setup on N nodes. A single or more load generators (depending on the experiment) create the load, doing HTTP requests randomly over N Rebel application nodes, backed by $2N$ Cassandra database nodes. All log their system and relevant experiment metrics to an InfluxDB instance for retrieval when the experiment completes.

Our experiment setup runs on Amazon ECS (Elastic Container Service) using Docker images for the Database (Cassandra), the Application, Metrics (InfluxDB), and the Load generator (Gatling [Gatling 2018]). Figure 8 shows an overview of the setup. The specific version of Cassandra is 3.11.2 on OpenJDK 64-Bit Server VM/1.8.0_171. The application runs on Akka version 2.5.13, Oracle Java 1.8.0_172-b11, with tuned garbage collector G1 with `MAXGC-PAUSEMILLIS=100`.

In order to prevent CPU or memory starvation/contention between the application and the load generator tool, we deploy each of the application components on a different virtual host on Amazon Web Services (AWS). We use EC2 instance type `M4.XLARGE`³ for all our VMs, which are located in the Frankfurt region in a single data center and availability zone.

As shown in Figure 8 each of these containers is deployed on its own container instance (host), with the exception of Metrics and Load generator, which share a host. Metrics being sent asynchronously over UDP, to ensure minimal interference with application performance⁴.

For realism of the experiment a real journal implementation is used, in this case Cassandra, as it is a common industry standard and often used in production for Akka persistence clusters. Here it is used as an append-only log for the persistent actors, so limited synchronization is done on the database level, although it gives realistic overhead. We overprovision the database to make sure it is not the bottleneck.

Our tooling supports running the performance load from multiple nodes. Experimentally we discovered that setting up the correct experiment for high load is hard and a lot of things are not trivial: such as the correct number of file descriptors for connections; garbage collection tuning; library versions with bugs; careful load generation to capture the sustainable throughput; ratio of application, load and database nodes; collection of metrics for all components; and validating correct deployment before running the experiment. We collect system metrics for all machines in order to monitor overload of any specific part. Also we enable the low-overhead JDK flight recorder profiling for after-the-fact bottleneck analysis of our application nodes.

When load testing applications, the crafting of the load is very important, and not trivial. A distinction often used is closed versus open systems [Schroeder et al. 2006]. Closed systems have a fixed number of users, each doing requests to the service, one after another. Open systems have a stream of users requesting at a certain rate, meaning there is no such maximum of concurrent requests as in a closed system. Typically closed systems are used for batch systems and open systems for online usage. Schroeder et al. [Schroeder et al. 2006] describe a useful variant which is partly open, meaning that users keep arriving at a certain rate, but can do more than a single request, while still eventually finish using the service.

³m4.xlarge: 4 vCPU, 16 GiB Memory, EBS-based SSD storage, 750 Mbps Dedicated EBS Bandwidth.

⁴CPU and other system metrics are monitored to prevent this.

For all experiments presented in this paper, we employ an closed system workload approach. Open-world workloads quickly result in an overloaded application, both for 2PC and PSAC, which obscures the differences between them. In an enterprise setting, such as a bank, a (hardware) load balancer translates the open workload behavior to a more closed world behavior by limiting the number of network connections and reusing them.

4.3 Baseline Experiments: Akka Scalability

To make sure that Akka or our setup does not influence the result of evaluating the performance of PSAC, we run four experiments on top of Akka to establish horizontal scalability. The baseline experiments use a setup as similar as possible to the more involved experiments discussed later. We run multiple variants that increase in complexity, building up to all the features used by the Rebel implementation, and measure the maximum number of sustainable throughput (requests/transactions per second) per each increment of application complexity.

The following experiments were run:

- (1) BARE – HTTP: responses are immediately given by the HTTP layer.
- (2) SIMPLE – HTTP + Actors: Each request triggers an actor creation which completes the request.
- (3) SHARDING – HTTP + Sharded Actors: Actors are equally spread over the cluster and respond to the requests.
- (4) PERSISTENCE – HTTP + Sharded Persistent Actors: Actors are spread equally over the cluster and wait for a successful write to the persistence layer (Cassandra) before responding to the request.

Figure 9 shows the results of the experiments. Data points are throughput in terms of successful responses per second during the stable load of the experiment, after warm-up and ramp-up of users. For warm- and ramp-up we increase the number of simulated user over time, to give the application some time to get up to speed. The plot also shows a fit to Amdahl’s [Amdahl 1967] law using a non-linear least squares regression analysis. For intuitive comparison we include the upper bound of linear scalability line for each of the experiments.

Amdahl’s law is defined as:

$$X(N) = \frac{\lambda N}{1 + \sigma(N - 1)}$$

$X(N)$ is the throughput when N nodes are used. Linear scalability means that the contention σ is 0 and the throughput grows with λ , which denotes the throughput of the single application node. The fitted values for λ and σ are shown in Table 1.

All variants have very different performance per node. This is expected, by the increasingly complex actions performed. Increasingly complex variants have increasing σ , which can be explained by increased synchronization between actors. All experiments show horizontal scalability up until an expected peak throughput on Amdahl’s law asymptote ($a_{inf} = \lambda\sigma^{-1}$), which is the theoretical maximum throughput which can not be further improved by adding more nodes.

The results show that our implementation using Akka exhibits horizontal scalability and corroborates H0.


4.4 Synchronization Experiments: PSAC vs 2PC

To compare the performance of PSAC and 2PC, we run three experiments with different synchronization characteristics, linked to the relevant hypothesis:

- (1) NoSync – OPENACCOUNT: A Rebel operation without SYNC. (H1)
- (2) Sync – BOOK: A Rebel operation with SYNC, synchronizing with WITHDRAW and DEPOSIT on two accounts. (H2)

experiment	λ (tps)	σ	$a_{inf} = \lambda\sigma^{-1}$ (tps)
BARE	16 751	0.002 923 3	5 729 998
SIMPLE	10 372	0.000 877 3	11 822 028
SHARDING	6303	0.004 728 5	1 332 920
PERSISTENCE	1928	0.008 159 7	236 281

Table 1. Baseline experiment fit to Amdahl's law and asymptote

Fig. 9. Throughput $X(N)$, Amdahl fit and linear scalability upper bound (u.b.) of baseline experiments

(3) SYNC1000 – BOOK on a limited number of accounts, to increase the contention. (H3)

These different scenarios enable us to see if and when PSAC improves over 2PC, especially in the SYNC1000 high-contention experiment. On the one hand NoSYNC and SYNC show where PSAC does not improve over 2PC. On the other hand SYNC1000 shows the high-contention scenario where PSAC improves over 2PC. SYNC1000 captures a real bottleneck in practice, found in ING transaction data.

All three scenarios are executed using a closed system approach [Schroeder et al. 2006], where we limit the number of concurrent users, each continually doing requests. This ensures that the application is not overloaded by too many requests, which would cause high failure rates. Each experiment is run consecutively for increasing node count N , with N load generator nodes (except SYNC1000) to grow the load proportionally. SYNC1000 runs a single load generator which increases the load in incremental steps in order to determine the maximum throughput until the application overloads.

In all experiments we compare 2PC's and PSAC's throughput ($X(N)$) for a varying number of application nodes N .

4.4.1 NoSYNC. The NoSYNC experiment is the Open Account scenario which does not contain a Rebel SYNC. It corresponds to hypothesis H1, which states that 2PC and PSAC should have similar throughput when there is no synchronization for the actions involved. The results are plotted in Figure 10a. We can observe that the throughput of the two variants is similar, as expected and thus corroborates H1. The throughput is only limited by the CPU-usage on the nodes and the creation of records in the data store. In the metrics data the application CPU usage drops to around 80% and the data store CPU usage is almost 100%.

4.4.2 Sync. The SYNC experiment contains a SYNC in the BOOK action and corresponds to H2, which states that we expect that PSAC and 2PC also have similar throughput in this low-contention scenario. The results are shown in Figure 10b. Here we also see the same performance for both 2PC and PSAC, corroborating H2. This can be explained by the experiment setup: The BOOK actions are done between two accounts uniformly picked from 100.000 accounts created before the experiment. With a maximum throughput of roughly 1500 and uniformly spread transactions the chance of actually having more than one transaction on a single account is negligible.

The absolute throughput numbers are lower than NoSYNC, however, which is explained by the fact that BOOK has to do more work, since it involves three instances: a TRANSACTION and two ACCOUNTS.

4.4.3 Sync1000. Finally, SYNC1000 introduces artificial contention by reducing the number of accounts to 1000, corresponding with H3. H3 states in high-contention scenarios that PSAC is expected to have higher throughput than 2PC, because it is able to avoid blocking where 2PC can not. This results in a difference between 2PC and PSAC, as seen in Figure 10c. Since this is the most interesting case we have run the experiment for higher node counts, and include a fit on Amdahl's law, shown in Figure 11. Figure 10d contains the fitted parameters. The results show that PSAC consistently achieves higher throughput than 2PC.

The metrics show that both application and data store CPU usage starts dropping for node counts > 9 . This can be explained by contention: busy entities are at their maximum throughput for 2PC transactions. In the case of PSAC this also happens, because the number of parallel transactions is limited by configuration at 8. Nevertheless, PSAC consistently achieves higher throughput.

The latency numbers (shown in Figure 12) for PSAC are similar to 2PC. This also shows clearly that PSAC reaches higher throughput levels and that PSAC is on par or better latency-wise with 2PC up to at least the breaking point of 2PC.

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Threats to Validity & Limitations

We distinguish between internal and external threats to validity. Internal threats are concerned with problems of configuration and bugs in the implementation. External threats are about the generalization of the results. Regarding construct validity we have mitigated this risk by first doing a infrastructure and a NoSYNC experiment H0, in order to make sure that we actually measure the intended construct: comparing PSAC against 2PC. Below we discuss internal and external threats to validity in more detail.

5.1.1 Internal threats to validity. To make sure that we do not have differences in configuration and deployment of our experiments, we designed and implemented an experiment runner leveraging AWS to automatically run the different scenarios required for each experiment on the available




Fig. 10. Throughput $X(N)$ against number of nodes N

VMs. The experiments are defined using declarative configuration, to make them reproducible and without configuration mistakes⁶.

Each node size for each experiment is run separately on AWS. The use of docker images and automated tooling makes sure that the configuration and artifacts for each of the experiments is the same, except for the specific differences that we want to A/B test.

⁶We plan to release artifacts and source code of the experiment scripts, algorithms, and application.

⁶A pirate plot is a combination of violin plot, box plot and bar chart. Line is the median, points are the data points. This gives a complete overview of the data (data points and distribution in violin plot) and an aggregated view.




Fig. 11. Plot of Amdahl fit and corresponding linear scalability upper bound (u.b.) for SYNC1000 on higher node counts.




Fig. 12. Latency percentiles (logarithmic scale) of SYNC1000 grouped per number of nodes. Lower is better.

Another threat is the Amazon virtual machine environment the experiments are run on. Nodes can be run on possibly shared hosts, which may impact performance depending on noisy neighbors, differences in hardware, or even time of day. Another threat to validity is related to warm-up of the Java virtual machine, or that the experiments have not been run long enough to obtain reliable results. We mitigated this threat partially by running the experiments on many different occasions and manually validating that the results are similar to previous runs.

Another possible influence on the performance results is the persistence layer. In order to make sure the persistence layer is not the bottleneck, we should monitor metrics of the database nodes, such as CPU, IO and memory usage. If none of them continuously peak, we assume this is not a bottleneck. However, during the execution of some of the experiments the state of the persistence layer has not been monitored consistently.

Warm up time is frequently the bottleneck in data parallel distributed systems on the JVM [Lion et al. 2016], so this factor may not be eliminated by our experiments.

5.1.2 External threats to validity. Our throughput results might be too hard on the system, resulting in higher throughput but worse response times than we want. This could obscure comparison and generalization. For instance, the SYNC1000 experiment for PSAC showed overall higher throughput, but at the cost of higher latencies. We expect that tuning of the load will reduce the pressure on the application and will result in similar latencies as for 2PC but still with higher throughput.

The experiments reported on in this section are still relatively isolated. Further work is needed to obtain results in different settings, and different kinds of loads. For instance, it would be interesting to see how PSAC performs on some well-known benchmarks, such as TPC-C [Raab et al. 2013], the twitter-like Retwis Workload [Leau 2013], YCSB [Cooper et al. 2010] and the SmallBank benchmark [Cahill et al. 2009]. TPC-C, YCSB, a twitter benchmark, and more can be found as part OLTPBench [Difallah et al. 2013], which is a tool that can be used to run benchmarks.

A geo-located setup, furthermore, would make the experiments more realistic, because round trip times to application nodes and database nodes are relatively large. We expect contention to be more of a problem there, because the latency of individual transactions (and thus the amount of locking) goes up. PSAC could be extended to employ techniques similar to Explicit Consistency [Balegas et al. 2015] to allow parallel multi-regional actions without immediate communication.

5.1.3 Limitations. A current limitation of PSAC is that it does not offer fairness for dependent actions. PSAC accepts new independent actions when there are also dependent actions in the wait queue. This possibly results in a new in-progress action that keeps the queued action dependent, and thus it will potentially never be removed from the queue. A potential solution is to consider the dependency of the queued actions on the incoming action, when determining independence, so that queued actions are never requeued indefinitely. Another, simpler but less fair, solution is to make sure only a limited number of independent actions can go before the dependent action.

5.2 Related work

Much related work [Bailis 2015; Bailis et al. 2014; Balegas et al. 2015; Hellerstein and Alvaro 2019; Narula et al. 2014; Prego et al. 2018] on preventing coordination relies on reordering and commutativity of operations in order to allow parallel operations in possible different geo-distributed data centers. PSAC does not require commutativity. At run-time PSAC detects if it can safely start new incoming actions while others are still in progress, and indeed includes all commutative actions. However even for non-commutative actions PSAC will potentially avoid blocking if they are independent in the current run-time state, e.g., two withdrawal actions are non-commutative, but will run in parallel by PSAC if the run-time balance is sufficient for both.

Orleans [Orleans 2018] is an actor based distributed application framework that implements transactions [Eldeeb and Bernstein 2016] in a similar way to 2PC, but with a central Transaction Manager, which decides if transactions are incompatible. To support high throughput the distributed object/grain releases the 2PC lock when it prepares successfully, and already applies the new state. This can mean that some actions are already applied on top of that before the initial transaction is completed by the Transaction Manager. If some other distributed object votes NO and triggers the abort, all the actions on top are also aborted (cascading abort). This solution thus can have high throughput, but it drops when aborts happen regularly on congested instances.

Reactors [Reactors 2018] is a distributed computing framework defined on reactors: actors reacting to events. It uses Reactor transactions with nested sub-transactions, but is not yet tested in a cluster of nodes. Their current implementation also uses 2PC in the transaction manager.

ROCOCO [Mu et al. 2014] reorders transactions at run time, whenever possible, instead of aborting. It uses offline detection, but only works on stored procedures. Coordination Avoidance focuses on lock-free algorithms in a geo-replicated setting [Bailis 2015; Bailis et al. 2014]. It makes sure that transactions do not conflict, and allows them on multiple geo-located data centers without coordination. They are eventually merged in an asynchronous fashion.

PSAC can be characterized as a kind of coordination avoidance. [Bailis 2015] states: “Invariant Confluence captures a simple, informal rule: coordination can only be avoided if all local commit decisions are globally valid.” PSAC focuses on local avoidance of coordination of transactions on objects and it is yet to be seen how well it works in a geo-replicated setting.

More recent work in distributed systems is investigating what is needed to keep a program correct, instead of data-consistency (or memory consistency) where write-registers are always in a consistent state, which is what 2PC ensures. The CALM [Hellerstein and Alvaro 2019] theorem shows that monotonic programs do not need coordination. In a sense PSAC is a step towards CALM on the local object level, where objects only grows monotonically by applying actions in the correct order, exploiting the program’s functional requirements.

The Escrow Method [O’Neil 1986; Weikum and Vossen 2002] is a way to handle high contention records for long running transactions. Balegas et al. [Balegas et al. 2015] discuss Escrow reservations where numeric fields can be divided over multiple (geo-located) nodes, and each node can locally decide over that amount of the numeric value, and has to communicate with the rest when it needs more than that part. In the banking example this is analogous to splitting the balance of an account in parts and allow nodes to locally mutate that part without synchronization. Although PSAC is not optimized for geo-separation, since an entity is not divisible in multiple parts, it is not limited to numeric fields.

PSAC is related to Predicate and Precision locks, but differs in the sense that the latter operate at the level of tuples. Predicate Locks [Eswaran et al. 1976; Gray and Reuter 1993; Jordan et al. 1981] only deal with predicates over multiple rows. Precision locks [Gray and Reuter 1993; Jordan et al. 1981] also only deal with locks over multiple rows, but not on the same data item/field/attribute. PSAC supports more granular locking because it allows two independent actions to change the same field or tuple.

Phase Reconciliation [Narula et al. 2014] is a run-time technique, that splits high-contention objects over multiple CPU cores. It allows specific commutative operations of a single type to be processed locally on the core in parallel and after a configurable window the results are reconciled again. Similar to PSAC is that operations should not return values, but PSAC does not require commutative operations or all operations to be of a single type. Phase Reconciliation could be useful to embed in PSAC to speed up applying of the effects within the object.

Flat Combining [Hendler et al. 2010] is an interesting technique to speed up concurrent access to data structures. It keeps track of all concurrent operations on an object and the first thread to

get the lock, batch processes the operations and informs the requester threads of their respective results. This batching of operations, instead of letting each thread obtain their own locks and doing their operation, results in improved throughput. Another part is cancelling out of operations, which the executing thread can do, e.g., cancel a pop for a push operation for a stack. Flat Combining focuses on applying operations on a shared data structure. PSAC differs, because it focuses on distributed transactions, where the actual transition are determined externally from the object by a transaction manager and not just on applying operations as fast as possible. Flat combining could be useful on the level of actor message handling. Actors receive messages, which can be batch processed by the first thread to obtain the lock on the actor. In practice Akka batch handles messages per actor and limits the number of messages per batch to ensure fairness.

5.3 Further Directions

PSAC is based on detecting independence of actions at run time. An alternative solution to avoid locking is to use static analysis of pre- and postconditions to determine whether certain types of actions are always independent of other types of actions. Actions which never influence the outcome of later actions, such as adding money to an account, can always be safely started. This is related to determining the commutativity of events and making sure all the orderings are monotonically increasing on the life cycle lattice of the specification. This is related to Conflict-Free Replicated Data Types (CRDTs) [Preguiça et al. 2018], coordination avoidance [Bailis et al. 2014] and explicit consistency [Balegas et al. 2015].

In this paper, we have presented PSAC informally. Further research is needed to obtain precise results about the consistency guarantees that PSAC offers. A potential direction could be to formally verify the correctness of PSAC, for instance, using TLA+ [Lamport 2002], or state-based formalization [Crooks et al. 2017].

Further, the implementation of PSAC could be improved by applying well-known optimizations of 2PC. For instance, using half round trip time locks [Bailis 2015] the set of participants is forwarded by the previous participant to the next, in a linked list-like fashion. This results in half the round trip time for acquiring the locks compared to the approach where locks are acquired one-by-one by the transaction coordinator.

Additional optimizations are possible in the representation of the outcome tree. For instance, outcomes could be grouped by abstractions, such as minimum or maximum values, sets of outcomes, or predicates deduced from pre- and postconditions. This reduces the size of the tree, and thus faster precondition checking.

PSAC can be further improved by reordering of actions. This would require commutative operations. At run time it can be checked if an incoming action is commutative with all in-progress actions, and safely reorder them. However, the pre- and postconditions should be explicit about time sensitive or otherwise importation functional action ordering.

The depth of the possible outcome tree is limited by configuration, because it grows exponentially in the number of in-progress actions. Benchmarks, not shown in this paper, shows that when it grows to big for the bank transaction use case, actions start timing out. This performance impact of varying this depth greatly depends on which actions are used and how much contention there is, but also how many other resources are running and what their contention is. More in-progress actions, result in more running actors and extra calculations of the tree. It is future work to find an approach to tune this tree depth.

In order evaluate the boundaries of applicability of PSAC, an extra experiment that tries to maximize the overhead of PSAC can be created. If computing preconditions or post states is expensive, the extra calculation overhead could result in worse performance than the sequential 2PC approach.

Keeping tail latencies low is important for online user experience. We can apply the techniques presented in The Tail at Scale [Dean and Barroso 2013] to make PSAC more latency tail-tolerant. This requires sending multiple omnipotent requests to different application nodes and effectively increasing replication factors of the entities. The current design does not fit this yet, since the runtime makes sure only one instance of each entity is alive in the cluster. PSAC can be extended, however, to support read-only versions, inferring actions that are commutative to be applied on different nodes in arbitrary order order.

6 CONCLUSION

Large organizations such as banks require enterprise software with ever higher demands on consistency and availability, while at the same time controlling the complexity of large application landscapes. In this paper, we have introduced path-sensitive atomic commit (PSAC), a novel concurrency mechanism that exploits domain knowledge from high-level specifications that describe the functionality of distributed objects or actors. PSAC avoids locking participants in a transaction by detecting whether requests sent to objects can be handled concurrently. Whether the effects of two or more requests are independent is established by analyzing the applicability and effects of message requests at run time.

PSAC has been implemented in the actor-based backend of Rebel, a state machine-based DSL for describing business objects and their life cycle. Rebel specifications are mapped to actors running on top of the Akka framework. Using different code generators this allowed us to explicitly compare standard 2PC to PSAC as locking strategies for when objects need to synchronize in transactions. We conducted an empirical evaluation on a realistic case of PSAC compared to an implementation based on standard two-phase commit (2PC). We designed multiple experiments to show specifically where PSAC and 2PC perform similar and where PSAC outperforms 2PC.

Our results show that in low contention scenarios with and without synchronization the throughput is similar, because no actions can be parallelized. However, PSAC performs up to 1.8 times better than 2PC in terms of median throughput in high contention scenarios. This is especially relevant, for instance, when a bank has to execute a large number of transactions on a single bank account. Latency-wise PSAC is on par or better than 2PC. Furthermore, PSAC scales as well as 2PC, and under specific non-uniform loads even better. We believe that PSAC will enable organizations to build scalable and easy-to-maintain Actor-based systems, even if their consistency requirements are not embarrassingly parallel.

REFERENCES

- Akka. 2018. <https://akka.io>
- Gene M. Amdahl. 1967. Validity of the single processor approach to achieving large scale computing capabilities. In *American Federation of Information Processing Societies: Proceedings of the AFIPS '67 Spring Joint Computer Conference, April 18-20, 1967, Atlantic City, New Jersey, USA (AFIPS Conference Proceedings)*, Vol. 30. AFIPS / ACM / Thomson Book Company, Washington D.C., 483–485.
- Peter Bailis. 2015. *Coordination Avoidance in Distributed Databases*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of California, Berkeley, USA.
- Peter Bailis, Alan Fekete, Michael J. Franklin, Ali Ghodsi, Joseph M. Hellerstein, and Ion Stoica. 2014. Coordination Avoidance in Database Systems. *PVLDB* 8, 3 (2014), 185–196.
- Valter Balegas, Sérgio Duarte, Carla Ferreira, Rodrigo Rodrigues, Nuno M. Pregoça, Mahsa Najafzadeh, and Marc Shapiro. 2015. Putting consistency back into eventual consistency. In *EuroSys*. ACM, 6:1–6:16.
- Philip A. Bernstein, Vassos Hadzilacos, and Nathan Goodman. 1987. *Concurrency Control and Recovery in Database Systems*. Addison-Wesley.
- Michael J. Cahill, Uwe Röhm, and Alan David Fekete. 2009. Serializable isolation for snapshot databases. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 34, 4 (2009), 20:1–20:42.

- Brian F. Cooper, Adam Silberstein, Erwin Tam, Raghu Ramakrishnan, and Russell Sears. 2010. Benchmarking cloud serving systems with YCSB. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing, SoCC 2010, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA, June 10-11, 2010*, Joseph M. Hellerstein, Surajit Chaudhuri, and Mendel Rosenblum (Eds.). ACM, 143–154.
- Natacha Crooks, Youer Pu, Lorenzo Alvisi, and Allen Clement. 2017. Seeing is Believing: A Client-Centric Specification of Database Isolation. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing, PODC 2017, Washington, DC, USA, July 25-27, 2017*, Elad Michael Schiller and Alexander A. Schwarzmann (Eds.). ACM, 73–82.
- Jeffrey Dean and Luiz André Barroso. 2013. The tail at scale. *Commun. ACM* 56, 2 (2013), 74–80.
- Andrzej Debski, Bartłomiej Szczepanik, Maciej Malawski, Stefan Spahr, and Dirk Muthig. 2018. A Scalable, Reactive Architecture for Cloud Applications. *IEEE Software* 35, 2 (2018), 62–71.
- Djellel Eddine Difallah, Andrew Pavlo, Carlo Curino, and Philippe Cudré-Mauroux. 2013. OLTP-Bench: An Extensible Testbed for Benchmarking Relational Databases. *PVLDB* 7, 4 (2013), 277–288.
- Tamer Eldeeb and Phil Bernstein. 2016. *Transactions for Distributed Actors in the Cloud*. Technical Report.
- Kapali P. Eswaran, Jim Gray, Raymond A. Lorie, and Irving L. Traiger. 1976. The Notions of Consistency and Predicate Locks in a Database System. *Commun. ACM* 19, 11 (1976), 624–633.
- Gatling. 2018. <https://gatling.io/>
- Jim Gray. 1978. Notes on Data Base Operating Systems. In *Operating Systems, An Advanced Course (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Michael J. Flynn, Jim Gray, Anita K. Jones, Klaus Lagally, Holger Opderbeck, Gerald J. Popek, Brian Randell, Jerome H. Saltzer, and Hans-Rüdiger Wiehle (Eds.), Vol. 60. Springer, 393–481.
- Jim Gray and Andreas Reuter. 1993. *Transaction Processing: Concepts and Techniques*. Morgan Kaufmann.
- Joseph M. Hellerstein and Peter Alvaro. 2019. Keeping CALM: When Distributed Consistency is Easy. *CoRR* abs/1901.01930 (2019). arXiv:1901.01930
- Danny Hendler, Itai Incze, Nir Shavit, and Moran Tzafrir. 2010. Flat combining and the synchronization-parallelism tradeoff. In *SPAA*. ACM, 355–364.
- Carl Hewitt, Peter Boehler Bishop, and Richard Steiger. 1973. A Universal Modular ACTOR Formalism for Artificial Intelligence. In *IJCAI*. William Kaufmann, 235–245.
- J. R. Jordan, J. Banerjee, and R. B. Batman. 1981. Precision Locks. In *Proceedings of the 1981 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, April 29 - May 1, 1981*, Y. Edmund Lien (Ed.). ACM Press, 143–147.
- Leslie Lamport. 2002. *Specifying Systems, The TLA+ Language and Tools for Hardware and Software Engineers*. Addison-Wesley.
- Costin Leau. 2013. Spring data redis-retwis-j.
- David Lion, Adrian Chiu, Hailong Sun, Xin Zhuang, Nikola Grcevski, and Ding Yuan. 2016. Don't Get Caught in the Cold, Warm-up Your JVM: Understand and Eliminate JVM Warm-up Overhead in Data-Parallel Systems. In *OSDI. USENIX Association*, 383–400.
- Shuai Mu, Yang Cui, Yang Zhang, Wyatt Lloyd, and Jinyang Li. 2014. Extracting More Concurrency from Distributed Transactions. In *11th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI '14, Broomfield, CO, USA, October 6-8, 2014.*, Jason Flinn and Hank Levy (Eds.). USENIX Association, 479–494.
- Neha Narula, Cody Cutler, Eddie Kohler, and Robert Tappan Morris. 2014. Phase Reconciliation for Contended In-Memory Transactions. In *OSDI. USENIX Association*, 511–524.
- Patrick E. O'Neil. 1986. The Escrow Transactional Method. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.* 11, 4 (1986), 405–430.
- Orleans. 2018. <https://dotnet.github.io/orleans/>
- M. Tamer Özsu and Patrick Valduriez. 2011. *Principles of Distributed Database Systems, Third Edition*. Springer.
- Nuno M. Prego, Carlos Baquero, and Marc Shapiro. 2018. Conflict-free Replicated Data Types (CRDTs). *CoRR* abs/1805.06358 (2018). arXiv:1805.06358
- Francois Raab, Walt Kohler, and Amitabh Shah. 2013. Overview of the TPC benchmark C: The order-entry benchmark. *Transaction Processing Performance Council, Tech. Rep* (2013).
- Reactors. 2018. <http://reactors.io/>
- Bianca Schroeder, Adam Wierman, and Mor Harchol-Balter. 2006. Open Versus Closed: A Cautionary Tale. In *3rd Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 2006), May 8-10, 2007, San Jose, California, USA, Proceedings.*, Larry L. Peterson and Timothy Roscoe (Eds.). USENIX.
- Jouke Stoel, Tijs van der Storm, Jurgen J. Vinju, and Joost Bosman. 2016. Solving the bank with Rebel: on the design of the Rebel specification language and its application inside a bank. In *ITSLE@SPLASH*. ACM, 13–20.
- Andrew S. Tanenbaum and Maarten van Steen. 2007. *Distributed systems - principles and paradigms, 2nd Edition*. Pearson Education.
- Gerhard Weikum and Gottfried Vossen. 2002. *Transactional Information Systems: Theory, Algorithms, and the Practice of Concurrency Control and Recovery*. Morgan Kaufmann.