## Lecture 02: Conceptual Design

Wednesday, October 6, 2010

## Nulls

- count(category) != count(*) WHY ?
- Office hours: Thursdays, 5-6pm


## Announcements

- Homework 2 is posted: due October 19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$
- You need to create tables, import data:
- On SQL Server, in your own database, OR
- On postgres (we will use it for Project 2)
- Follow Web instructions for importing data
- Read book about CREATE TABLE, INSERT, DELETE, UPDATE


## Discussion

SQL Databases v. NoSQL Databases, Mike Stonebraker

- What are "No-SQL Databases" ?
- What are the two main types of workloads in a database ? ( X and Y )
- How can one improve performance of $X$ ?
- Where does the time of a single server go ?
- What are "single-record transactions" ?


## Outline

- E/R diagrams
- From E/R diagrams to relations


## Database Design

- Why do we need it?
- Agree on structure of the database before deciding on a particular implementation.
- Consider issues such as:
- What entities to model
- How entities are related
- What constraints exist in the domain
- How to achieve good designs
- Several formalisms exists
- We discuss E/R diagrams


## Entity / Relationship Diagrams

Objects $\rightarrow$ entities
Classes $\rightarrow \quad$ entity sets
Product
Attributes:


Relationships


- first class citizens (not associated with classes)
- not necessarily binary


## Product

## Company

## Person




## Keys in E/R Diagrams

- Every entity set must have a key
- May be a multi-attribute key:



## What is a Relation ?

- A mathematical definition:
- if $A, B$ are sets, then a relation $R$ is a subset of $A \times B$
- $A=\{1,2,3\}, B=\{a, b, c, d\}$,
$A \times B=\{(1, a),(1, b), \ldots,(3, d)\}$
$R=\{(1, a),(1, c),(3, b)\}$

- makes is a subset of Product $\times$ Company:



## Multiplicity of E/R Relations

- one-one:
- many-one
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## Notation in Class v.s. the Book

In class:


In the book:



## Multi-way Relationships



## Converting Multi-way Relationships to Binary



## 3. Design Principles

## What's wrong?



## Design Principles: What's Wrong?



## Design Principles: What's Wrong?



## From E/R Diagrams to Relational Schema

- Entity set $\rightarrow$ relation
- Relationship $\rightarrow$ relation


## Entity Set to Relation



Product(prod-ID, category, price)

| prod-ID | category | price |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gizmo55 | Camera | 99.99 |
| Pokemn19 | Toy | 29.99 |

## Create Table (SQL)

## CREATE TABLE Product ( prod-ID CHAR(30) PRIMARY KEY, category VARCHAR(20), price double)

## Relationships to Relations



## Create Table (SQL)

CREATE TABLE Shipment ( name CHAR(30) REFERENCES Shipping-Co, prod-ID CHAR(30), cust-ID VARCHAR(20), date DATETIME,

PRIMARY KEY (name, prod-ID, cust-ID),
FOREIGN KEY (prod-ID, cust-ID)
REFERENCES Orders
)

## Multi-way Relationships to Relations



# Modeling Subclasses 

## Products <br> Software products <br> Educational products

## Subclasses



## Understanding Subclasses

- Think in terms of records:
- Product
field1
field2
- SoftwareProduct
field1
field2
- EducationalProduct
field3
field1
field2
field4
field5


## Subclasses to Relations



## Product

| Name | Price | Category |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gizmo | 99 | gadget |
| Camera | 49 | photo |
| Toy | 39 | gadget |



# Modeling UnionTypes With Subclasses 

## FurniturePiece

## Company

Say: each piece of furniture is owned either by a person, or by a company

## Modeling Union Types with Subclasses

Say: each piece of furniture is owned either by a person, or by a company
Solution 1. Acceptable (What's wrong?)


## Modeling Union Types with Subclasses

## Solution 2: More faithful



## Constraints in E/R Diagrams

Finding constraints is part of the modeling process. Commonly used constraints:

Keys: social security number uniquely identifies a person.
Single-value constraints: a person can have only one father.
Referential integrity constraints: if you work for a company, it must exist in the database.

Other constraints: peoples' ages are between 0 and 150.

## Keys in E/R Diagrams

Underline:


## Multi-attribute key

v.s.

Multiple keys

Not possible in E/R

## Single Value Constraints


v. s.


## Referential Integrity Constraints



Each product made by at most one company. Some products made by no company


Each product made by exactly one company.

## Other Constraints



## What does this mean?

## Weak Entity Sets

Entity sets are weak when their key comes from other classes to which they are related.


Notice: we encountered this when converting multiway relationships to binary relationships

## Handling Weak Entity Sets



How do we represent this with relations ?

## Weak Entity Sets

Weak entity set = entity where part of the key comes from another


Convert to a relational schema (in class)


# Design Theory 

## 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


## 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 |  |  |


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


|  | Takes |  | Course |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Student | Course |  |
| May need to add keys | Alice | Math | Course |
|  | Carol | Math | Math |
|  | Alice | DB | DB |
|  | Bob | DB | OS |
|  | Alice | OS | 45 |
|  | Carol | 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:



- 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:
$\forall t, t^{\prime} \in R,\left(t . A_{1}=t^{\prime} . A_{1} \wedge \ldots \wedge t . A_{m}=t^{\prime} . A_{m} \Rightarrow t . B_{1}=t^{\prime} . B_{1} \wedge \ldots \wedge t . B_{n}=t^{\prime} . B_{n}\right)$ R

if $t$, $t$ ' agree here then $t, t$ 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

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

| 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 $\rightarrow$ color |
| :--- |
| category $\rightarrow$ department |
| color, category $\rightarrow$ price |

Then this FD also holds:

```
name, category }->\mathrm{ 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

$$
\begin{array}{|l}
\begin{array}{l}
\mathrm{A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}_{1} \\
\mathrm{~A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}_{2} \\
\ldots \\
\mathrm{~A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A}_{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline & \mathrm{AI} & \ldots & \mathrm{Am} & & \mathrm{Bl} & \ldots & \mathrm{Bm} & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{array} \\
\text { Dan Suciu -- CSEP544 Fall 2010 }
\end{array}
$$

## Armstrong's Rules (2/3)

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

Trivial Rule

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

Why?


## Armstrong's Rules (3/3)

## 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

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

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

## 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:
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. $\mathrm{A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{B}$

Example:

Closures:

> | name $\rightarrow$ color |
| :--- |
| category $\rightarrow$ department |
| color, category $\rightarrow$ price |

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

## Closure Algorithm

$X=\{A 1, \ldots, A n\}$.

Repeat until X doesn't change do:
if $\quad \mathrm{B}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}$ is a FD and $\mathrm{B}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{n}}$ are all in X then add C to X .
$\{\text { name, category }\}^{+}=$ \{

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

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

## Example

In class:
R(A,B,C,D,E,F)

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

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 $X \rightarrow A$
- Compute X $^{+}$
- Check if $A \in X^{+}$


## Using Closure to Infer ALL FDs

Example:

$$
\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll|}
\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{~B} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{C} \\
\mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{D} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{~B} \\
\mathrm{~B} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{D} \\
\hline
\end{array}\right.
$$

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

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

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


## Example

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

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

What is the key?

## Example

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

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

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:

- $X \rightarrow A$ is $O K$ if $X$ is a (super)key
- $X \rightarrow A$ 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?\}

## 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 80

## Key or Keys ?

Can we have more than one key ?

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

## Key or Keys ?

Can we have more than one key ?

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

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

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 $\mathrm{A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{n}} \rightarrow \mathrm{B}$ 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 $)$ Dan Suciu -- CSEP544 Fall 2010

## BCNF Decomposition Alaorithm

## repeat

choose $\mathrm{A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{m}} \rightarrow \mathrm{B}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{n}}$ that violates BNCF
split R into $\mathrm{R}_{1}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{m}}, \mathrm{B}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ and $\mathrm{R}_{2}\left(\mathrm{~A}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{m}}\right.$, [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 <br> not in BCNF ? 

In practice, we have a better algorithm (coming ${ }^{84}$ 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 \}
use SSN $\rightarrow$ Name, City
to split

## Example

| Name | SSN | City |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SSN $\rightarrow$ Name, City |  |  |
|  | $123-45-6789$ | Seattle |
| Joe | $987-65-4321$ | Westfield |


| SSN | PhoneNumber |
| :--- | :--- |
| $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-1234$ |
| $123-45-6789$ | $206-555-6543$ |
| $987-65-4321$ | $908-555-2121$ |
| $987-65-4321$ | $908-555-1234$ |
|  | Redundancy $?$ |
| Update? |  |
| Delete? |  |

## Example Decomposition

Person(name, SSN, age, hairColor, phoneNumber)

SSN $\rightarrow$ name, age<br>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 $\rightarrow$ name, age<br>age $\rightarrow$ hairColor



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

## Example BCNF Decomposition

Person(name, SSN, age, hairColor, phoneNumber)

SSN $\rightarrow$ name, age<br>age $\rightarrow$ hairColor

## What are the keys?

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)

R(A,B,C,D)

## Example

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

## R(A,B,C,D) $\mathrm{A}^{+}=\mathrm{ABC} \neq \mathrm{ABCD}$

R(A,B,C,D)

## Example

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



What happens if in R we first pick $\mathrm{B}^{+}$? Or $\mathrm{AB}^{+}$?
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## Decompositions in General



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

## 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 $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n} \rightarrow C_{1}, \ldots, C_{p}$

