

Database - Bug #2034

correct conversion of CAN-FIND({FIRST|LAST} ... {SHARE-LOCK|EXCLUSIVE_LOCK} [NO-WAIT])

02/21/2013 10:54 PM - Eric Faulhaber

Status: New	Start date:
Priority: Normal	Due date:
Assignee:	% Done: 0%
Category:	Estimated time: 0.00 hour
Target version:	
billable: No	case_num:
vendor_id: GCD	version:
Description	
Related to Database - Bug #3040: CAN-FIND issues New	

History

#1 - 02/21/2013 10:59 PM - Eric Faulhaber

Currently, we convert CAN-FIND({FIRST|LAST} ...) with a lock the same as we do as if it doesn't have a lock; that is, to use FindQuery.hasAny(). In the locking case, however, hasAny is not specific enough, because we have to test whether the particular, found record could be locked. So, we need to add hasFirst and hasLast for the locking case.

#2 - 04/09/2013 11:56 AM - Eric Faulhaber

- Target version changed from Milestone 7 to 24

On second thought, as long as the sort phrase is correct, hasAny will find the correct first or last record. So, rather than adding hasFirst and hasLast, we should invert the sort phrase in cases of FIND LAST and leave it alone in cases of FIND FIRST, and hasAny will work as is. In other words, the current runtime should be OK; this would require only a conversion change.

There are no cases of FIND LAST ... {SHARE|EXCLUSIVE}-LOCK in the current (server) project, so the current conversion (by happy accident) works correctly.

We may need to revisit this for the gui project, and anyway a more correct solution is to invert the sort phrase for FIND LAST in all cases (even NO-LOCK). Note that this change may have performance implications for databases which cannot identify an index to use for the query when the sort phrase is inverted.

#3 - 11/16/2016 01:16 PM - Greg Shah

- Target version deleted (24)