## Lectures 8 and 9: Database Design

Wednesday\&Friday, April 10\&12

## Announcements/Reminders

- Homework 1: solutions are posted
- Homework 2: posted (due Friday, April 20)
- Project Phase 1 due Friday, April 12


## Outline

- The relational data model: 3.1
- Functional dependencies: 3.4


## Schema Refinements $=$ Normal Forms

- 1st Normal Form = all tables are flat
- 2nd Normal Form = obsolete
- Boyce Codd Normal Form = will study
- 3rd Normal Form = see book


## First Normal Form (1NF)

- A database schema is in First Normal Form if all tables are flat


## Student

| Name | GPA | Courses |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alice | 3.8 | Math <br> DB <br> os <br> Bob <br> 3.7 <br> Carol <br> 3.9 <br> OB |
| Oath |  |  |

## Student

| Name | GPA |
| :---: | :---: |
| Alice | 3.8 |
| Bob | 3.7 |
| Carol | 3.9 |


| Takes |
| :--- |
| Student Course <br> Alice Course <br> Carol Math <br> Alice DB <br> Bob DB <br> Alice OS <br> Carol OS$\quad$Course <br> Math <br> DB <br> OS |

## Relational Schema Design

Conceptual Model:


Relational Model: plus FD's


Normalization:
Eliminates anomalies


## Data Anomalies

When a database is poorly designed we get anomalies:

Redundancy: data is repeated

Updated anomalies: need to change in several places

Delete anomalies: may lose data when we don't want

## Relational Schema Design

Recall set attributes (persons with several phones):

| Name | SSN | PhoneNumber | City |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fred | $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-1234$ | Seattle |
| Fred | $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-6543$ | Seattle |
| Joe | $987-65-4321$ | $908-555-2121$ | Westfield |

One person may have multiple phones, but lives in only one city

## Anomalies:

- Redundancy = repeat data
- Update anomalies $=$ Fred moves to "Bellevue"
- Deletion anomalies = Joe deletes his phone number: what is his city?


## Relation Decomposition

Break the relation into two:

|  | Name <br> Fred <br> Fred <br> Joe | SSN | PhoneNumber | City |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 123-45-6789 | 206-555-1234 | Seattle |
|  |  | 123-45-6789 | 206-555-6543 | Seattle |
|  |  | 987-65-4321 | 908-555-2121 | Westfield |
| Name | SSN | City | SSN | PhoneNumber |
| Fred | 123-45-6789 | Seattle | 123-45-6789 | 206-555-1234 |
| Joe | 987-65-4321 | Westfield | 123-45-6789 | 206-555-6543 |
| Anomalies have gone: |  |  | 987-65-4321 | 908-555-2121 |

- No more repeated data
- Easy to move Fred to "Bellevue" (how ?)
- Easy to delete all Joe's phone number (how ?)


## Relational Schema Design (or Logical Design)

Main idea:

- Start with some relational schema
- Find out its functional dependencies
- Use them to design a better relational schema


## Functional Dependencies

- A form of constraint
- hence, part of the schema
- Finding them is part of the database design
- Also used in normalizing the relations


## Functional Dependencies

## Definition:

If two tuples agree on the attributes

$$
\mathrm{A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}}
$$

then they must also agree on the attributes

$$
\mathrm{B}_{1}, \mathrm{~B}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}}
$$

Formally:

$$
\mathrm{A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}_{1}, \mathrm{~B}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}}
$$

## When Does an FD Hold

Definition: $\quad A_{1}, \ldots, A_{m} \rightarrow B_{1}, \ldots, B_{n}$ holds in $R$ if:

$$
\forall \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{t}^{\prime} \in \mathrm{R},\left(\mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{~A}_{1}=\mathrm{t}^{\prime} . \mathrm{A}_{1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{m}}=\mathrm{t}^{\prime} . \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{m}} \Rightarrow \mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{~B}_{1}=\mathrm{t}^{\prime} . \mathrm{B}_{1} \wedge \ldots \wedge \mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{n}}=\mathrm{t}^{\prime} . \mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)
$$

R

if $t$, $t$ ' agree here then $t, t^{\prime}$ agree here

## Examples

An FD holds, or does not hold on an instance:

| EmpID | Name | Phone | Position |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E0045 | Smith | 1234 | Clerk |
| E3542 | Mike | 9876 | Salesrep |
| E1111 | Smith | 9876 | Salesrep |
| E9999 | Mary | 1234 | Lawyer |

EmpID $\rightarrow$ Name, Phone, Position
Position $\rightarrow$ Phone
but not Phone $\rightarrow$ Position

## Example

| EmpID | Name | Phone | Position |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| E0045 | Smith | 1234 | Clerk |  |
| E3542 | Mike | $9876 \leftarrow$ | Salesrep |  |
| E1111 | Smith | $9876 \leftarrow$ | Salesrep |  |
| E9999 | Mary | 1234 | Lawyer |  |
| Position $\rightarrow$ Phone |  |  |  |  |

## Example

| EmpID | Name | Phone | Position |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E0045 | Smith | $1234 \rightarrow$ | Clerk |
| E3542 | Mike | 9876 | Salesrep |
| E1111 | Smith | 9876 | Salesrep |
| E9999 | Mary | $1234 \rightarrow$ | Lawyer |

but not Phone $\rightarrow$ Position

## Example

FD's are constraints:

- On some instances they hold
- On others they don't

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { name } \rightarrow \text { color } \\
& \text { category } \rightarrow \text { department } \\
& \text { color, category } \rightarrow \text { price }
\end{aligned}
$$

| name | category | color | department | price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gizmo | Gadget | Green | Toys | 49 |
| Tweaker | Gadget | Green | Toys | 99 |

Does this instance satisfy all the FDs ?

## Example

name $\rightarrow$ color category $\rightarrow$ department color, category $\rightarrow$ price

| name | category | color | department | price |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gizmo | Gadget | Green | Toys | 49 |
| Tweaker | Gadget | Black | Toys | 99 |
| Gizmo | Stationary | Green | Office-supp. | 59 |

## An Interesting Observation

If all these FDs are true:

```
name }->\mathrm{ color
category }->\mathrm{ department
color, category }->\mathrm{ price
```

Then this FD also holds:
name, category $\rightarrow$ price

## Goal: Find ALL Functional Dependencies

- Anomalies occur when certain "bad" FDs hold
- We know some of the FDs
- Need to find all FDs, then look for the bad ones


## Armstrong's Rules (1/3)

$$
\mathrm{A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}_{1}, \mathrm{~B}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}}
$$

Is equivalent to
Splitting rule
and
Combing rule


## Armstrong's Rules (1/3)

$$
\mathrm{A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{i}}
$$

Trivial Rule

where $\mathrm{i}=1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{n}$

Why?


## Armstrong's Rules (1/3)

## Transitive Closure Rule

If

$$
\mathrm{A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}_{1}, \mathrm{~B}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}}
$$

and

$$
\mathrm{B}_{1}, \mathrm{~B}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}_{1}, \mathrm{C}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}
$$

then

$$
\mathrm{A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}_{1}, \mathrm{C}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}
$$

Why?

|  | $\mathrm{A}_{1}$ | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{m}}$ |  | $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}}$ |  | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | $\ldots$ | $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Example (continued)

Start from the following FDs:

Infer the following FDs:

| Inferred FD | Which Rule <br> did we apply ? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. name, category $\rightarrow$ name |  |
| 5. name, category $\rightarrow$ color |  |
| 6. name, category $\rightarrow$ category |  |
| 7. name, category $\rightarrow$ color, category |  |
| 8. name, category $\rightarrow$ price |  |

## Example (continued)

Answers:

1. name $\rightarrow$ color
2. category $\rightarrow$ department
3. color, category $\rightarrow$ price

| Inferred FD | Which Rule <br> did we apply ? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 4. name, category $\rightarrow$ name | Trivial rule |
| 5. name, category $\rightarrow$ color | Transitivity on 4, 1 |
| 6. name, category $\rightarrow$ category | Trivial rule |
| 7. name, category $\rightarrow$ color, category | Split/combine on 5, 6 |
| 8. name, category $\rightarrow$ price | Transitivity on 3, 7 |

THIS IS TOO HARD! Let's see an easier way.

## Closure of a set of Attributes

Given a set of attributes $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}$
The closure, $\left\{\mathrm{A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}}\right\}^{+}=$the set of attributes B s.t. $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n} \rightarrow B$

Example:

Closures:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { name } \rightarrow \text { color } \\
& \text { category } \rightarrow \text { department } \\
& \text { color, category } \rightarrow \text { price }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text { name }^{+}=\{\text {name, color }\}
$$

$$
\{\text { name }, \text { category }\}^{+}=\{\text {name, category, color, department, price }\}
$$

$$
\text { color }^{+}=\{\text {color }\}
$$

## Closure Algorithm

$X=\{A 1, \ldots, A n\}$.
Repeat until X doesn't change do:
if $\quad B_{1}, \ldots, B_{n} \rightarrow C$ is a $F D$ and $\mathrm{B}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{n}}$ are all in X then add C to X .

Example:

```
name }->\mathrm{ color
category }->\mathrm{ department
color, category }->\mathrm{ price
```

$\{\text { name, category }\}^{+}=$
\{ name, category, color, department, price \}
Hence: name, category $\rightarrow$ color, department, price

## Example

## In class:

R(A,B,C,D,E,F)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{C} \\
& \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{D} \rightarrow \mathrm{E} \\
& \mathrm{~B} \\
& \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~F} \rightarrow \mathrm{D} \\
& \mathrm{~B}
\end{aligned}
$$

Compute $\{\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}\}^{+} \quad \mathrm{X}=\{\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$,
Compute $\{\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{F}\}^{+} \quad \mathrm{X}=\{\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{F}$,

## Why Do We Need Closure

- With closure we can find all FD's easily
- To check if $\mathrm{X} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}$
- Compute $\mathrm{X}^{+}$
- Check if $\mathrm{A} \in \mathrm{X}^{+}$


## Using Closure to Infer ALL FDs

Example:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{~B} & \rightarrow \mathrm{C} \\
\mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{D} & \rightarrow \mathrm{~B} \\
\mathrm{~B} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{D}
\end{array}
$$

Step 1: Compute $\mathrm{X}^{+}$, for every X :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{A}+=\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{~B}+=\mathrm{BD}, \mathrm{C}+=\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}+=\mathrm{D} \\
& \mathrm{AB}+=\mathrm{ABCD}, \mathrm{AC}+=\mathrm{AC}, \mathrm{AD}+=\mathrm{ABCD}, \\
& \mathrm{BC}+=\mathrm{BCD}, \mathrm{BD}+=\mathrm{BD}, \mathrm{CD}+=\mathrm{CD} \\
& \mathrm{ABC}+=\mathrm{ABD}+=\mathrm{ACD}^{+}=\mathrm{ABCD} \text { (no need to compute}- \text { why } ? \text { ) } \\
& \mathrm{BCD}^{+}=\mathrm{BCD}, \mathrm{ABCD}+=\mathrm{ABCD}
\end{aligned}
$$

Step 2: Enumerate all FD's $\mathrm{X} \rightarrow \mathrm{Y}$, s.t. $\mathrm{Y} \subseteq \mathrm{X}^{+}$and $\mathrm{X} \cap \mathrm{Y}=\varnothing$ :

$$
\mathrm{AB} \rightarrow \mathrm{CD}, \mathrm{AD} \rightarrow \mathrm{BC}, \mathrm{ABC} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{ABD} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{ACD} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}
$$

## Another Example

- Enrollment(student, major, course, room, time)
student $\rightarrow$ major
major, course $\rightarrow$ room
course $\rightarrow$ time

What else can we infer ? [in class, or at home]

## Keys

- A superkey is a set of attributes $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}$ s.t. for any other attribute $B$, we have $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n} \rightarrow B$
- A key is a minimal superkey
- I.e. set of attributes which is a superkey and for which no subset is a superkey


## Computing (Super)Keys

- Compute $\mathrm{X}^{+}$for all sets X
- If $\mathrm{X}^{+}=$all attributes, then X is a key
- List only the minimal X's


## Example

# Product(name, price, category, color) 

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { name, category } \rightarrow \text { price } \\
& \text { category } \rightarrow \text { color } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

What is the key?

## Example

## Product(name, price, category, color)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { name, category } \rightarrow \text { price } \\
& \text { category } \rightarrow \text { color } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$

What is the key?
(name, category) $+=$ name, category, price, color
Hence (name, category) is a key

## Examples of Keys

## Enrollment(student, address, course, room, time)

student $\rightarrow$ address<br>room, time $\rightarrow$ course<br>student, course $\rightarrow$ room, time

(find keys at home)

## Eliminating Anomalies

Main idea:

- $\mathrm{X} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}$ is OK if X is a (super)key
- $\mathrm{X} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}$ is not OK otherwise


## Example

| Name | SSN | PhoneNumber | City |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fred | $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-1234$ | Seattle |
| Fred | $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-6543$ | Seattle |
| Joe | $987-65-4321$ | $908-555-2121$ | Westfield |
| Joe | $987-65-4321$ | $908-555-1234$ | Westfield |

## SSN $\rightarrow$ Name, City

What the key?
\{SSN, PhoneNumber \}
Hence SSN $\rightarrow$ Name, City is a "bad" dependency

## Key or Keys?

Can we have more than one key?

Given $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C})$ define FD's s.t. there are two or more keys

## Key or Keys?

Can we have more than one key?

Given $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C})$ define FD's s.t. there are two or more keys

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{AB} \rightarrow \mathrm{C} \\
& \mathrm{BC} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}
\end{aligned} \quad \text { or } \quad \begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{BC} \\
& \mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{AC}
\end{aligned}
$$

what are the keys here ?
Can you design FDs such that there are three keys?

## Boyce-Codd Normal Form

A simple condition for removing anomalies from relations:
A relation R is in BCNF if:
If $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n} \rightarrow B$ is a non-trivial dependency in $R$, then $\left\{A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}\right\}$ is a superkey for $R$

In other words: there are no "bad" FDs

Equivalently:
$\forall \mathrm{X}$, either $\left(\mathrm{X}^{+}=\mathrm{X}\right) \quad$ or $\quad\left(\mathrm{X}^{+}=\right.$all attributes $)$

## BCNF Decomposition Algorithm

## repeat

choose $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{m} \rightarrow B_{1}, \ldots, B_{n}$ that violates BNCF
split $R$ into $R_{1}\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{m}, B_{1}, \ldots, B_{n}\right)$ and $R_{2}\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{m}\right.$, [others])
continue with both $\mathrm{R}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{R}_{2}$
until no more violations


## Is there a <br> 2-attribute <br> relation that is not in BCNF ?

In practice, we have a better algorithm (coming ${ }^{43}$ up)

## Example

| Name | SSN | PhoneNumber | City |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fred | $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-1234$ | Seattle |
| Fred | $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-6543$ | Seattle |
| Joe | $987-65-4321$ | $908-555-2121$ | Westfield |
| Joe | $987-65-4321$ | $908-555-1234$ | Westfield |

## SSN $\rightarrow$ Name, City

What the key?
\{SSN, PhoneNumber $\} \quad$ use SSN $\rightarrow$ Name, City to split

## Example

| Name | $\underline{\text { SSN }}$ | City |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fred | $123-45-6789$ | Seattle |
| Joe | $987-65-4321$ | Westfield |

SSN $\rightarrow$ Name, City

| SSN | $\underline{\text { PhoneNumber }}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-1234$ |
| $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-6543$ |
| $987-65-4321$ | $908-555-2121$ |
| $987-65-4321$ | $908-555-1234$ |

Let's check anomalies:
$\bullet$ Redundancy?

- Update?
- Delete?


## Example Decomposition

Person(name, SSN, age, hairColor, phoneNumber)
SSN $\rightarrow$ name, age
age $\rightarrow$ hairColor
Decompose in BCNF (in class):

## BCNF Decomposition Algorithm

BCNF_Decompose(R)
find X s.t.: $\mathrm{X} \neq \mathrm{X}^{+} \neq[$all attributes $]$
if (not found) then " $R$ is in BCNF"
let $\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{X}^{+}-\mathrm{X}$
let $\mathrm{Z}=$ [all attributes $]-\mathrm{X}^{+}$ decompose R into $\mathrm{R} 1(\mathrm{X} \cup \mathrm{Y})$ and $\mathrm{R} 2(\mathrm{X} \cup \mathrm{Z})$ continue to decompose recursively R1 and R2

Find X s.t.: $\mathrm{X} \neq \mathrm{X}^{+} \neq[$all attributes $]$

## Example BCNF Decomposition

```
Person(name, SSN, age, hairColor, phoneNumber)
    SSN }->\mathrm{ name, age
    age }->\mathrm{ hairColor
Iteration 1: Person
SSN+ = SSN, name, age, hairColor
Decompose into: P(SSN, name, age, hairColor)
    Phone(SSN, phoneNumber)
Iteration 2: P
age+ = age, hairColor
Decompose: People(SSN, name, age)
    Hair(age, hairColor)
    Phone(SSN, phoneNumber)
```

What are the keys?

```
R(A,B,C,D)
```


## Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B} \\
& \mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}
\end{aligned}
$$



What happens if in R we first pick $\mathrm{B}^{+}$? Or $\mathrm{AB}_{49}^{+}$?

## Decompositions in General


$\mathrm{R}_{1}=$ projection of R on $\mathrm{A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{B}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}}$
$\mathrm{R}_{2}=$ projection of R on $\mathrm{A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}}, \mathrm{C}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}$

## Theory of Decomposition

- Sometimes it is correct:


Lossless decomposition

## Incorrect Decomposition

- Sometimes it is not:



## Decompositions in General



$$
\text { If } \mathrm{A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}}
$$

Then the decomposition is lossless

Note: don't need $\mathrm{A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{p}}$

