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## How is this achieved?

- TM monitors accesses to objects
- When it detects conflicting access
- one transaction is aborted
- its actions are rolled back
- it is restarted
- When all actions are not conflicting
- transaction commits
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atomic \{
5: int $\mathrm{xl}=\mathrm{x}$;
6: int $y \mathbf{y}=\mathrm{y}$;
7: int zl = 1/(yl-xl);
8: $z=z l ;$
\}

## Consistent view

- All transactions must observe consistent views of memory at all times
- even the aborted ones


## Opacity

- Serializability
- there exists an equivalent serial (one thread) execution
- Consistent memory view
- no transaction can e.g. divide by zero because of non-consistent reads


## TM semantics

- Committed: instantaneous
- Aborted: never visible
- All: observe consistent state
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