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The Banking Schema

- branch = (branch_name, branch_city, assets)
- customer = (customer_id, customer_name, customer_street, customer_city)
- loan = (loan_number, amount)
- account = (account_number, balance)
- employee = (employee_id, employee_name, telephone_number, start_date)
- dependent_name = (employee_id, dname)
- account_branch = (account_number, branch_name)
- loan_branch = (loan_number, branch_name)
- borrower = (customer_id, loan_number)
- depositor = (customer_id, account_number)
- cust_banker = (customer_id, employee_id, type)
- works_for = (worker_employee_id, manager_employee_id)
- payment = (loan_number, payment_number, payment_date, payment_amount)
- savings_account = (account_number, interest_rate)
- checking_account = (account_number, overdraft_amount)
Combine Schemas?

- Suppose we combine borrow and loan to get
  \[ bor\_loan = (customer\_id, loan\_number, amount) \]
- Result is possible repetition of information (L-100 in example below)
Consider combining \textit{loan\_branch} and \textit{loan}.

\[\text{loan\_amt\_br} = (\text{loan\_number, amount, branch\_name})\]

No repetition (as suggested by example below)
What About Smaller Schemas?

- Suppose we had started with `bor_loan`. How would we know to split up (`decompose`) it into `borrower` and `loan`?
- Write a rule “if there were a schema `(loan_number, amount)`, then `loan_number` would be a candidate key”
- Denote as a functional dependency:
  
  \[
  loan_number \rightarrow amount
  \]
- In `bor_loan`, because `loan_number` is not a candidate key, the amount of a loan may have to be repeated. This indicates the need to decompose `bor_loan`.
- Not all decompositions are good. Suppose we decompose `employee` into
  
  \[
  employee1 = (employee_id, employee_name)
  \]
  
  \[
  employee2 = (employee_name, telephone_number, start_date)
  \]
- The next slide shows how we lose information -- we cannot reconstruct the original `employee` relation -- and so, this is a lossy decomposition.
A Lossy Decomposition
First Normal Form

- Domain is atomic if its elements are considered to be indivisible units
  - Examples of non-atomic domains:
    - Set of names, composite attributes
    - Identification numbers like CS101 that can be broken up into parts
- A relational schema R is in first normal form if the domains of all attributes of R are atomic
- Non-atomic values complicate storage and encourage redundant (repeated) storage of data
  - Example: Set of accounts stored with each customer, and set of owners stored with each account
  - We assume all relations are in first normal form (and revisit this in Chapter 9)
Atomicity is actually a property of how the elements of the domain are used.

- Example: Strings would normally be considered indivisible
- Suppose that students are given roll numbers which are strings of the form CS0012 or EE1127
- If the first two characters are extracted to find the department, the domain of roll numbers is not atomic.
- Doing so is a bad idea: leads to encoding of information in application program rather than in the database.
Goal — Devise a Theory for the Following

- Decide whether a particular relation $R$ is in “good” form.
- In the case that a relation $R$ is not in “good” form, decompose it into a set of relations \{$R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n$\} such that
  - each relation is in good form
  - the decomposition is a lossless-join decomposition
- Our theory is based on:
  - functional dependencies
  - multivalued dependencies
Functional Dependencies

- Constraints on the set of legal relations.
- Require that the value for a certain set of attributes determines uniquely the value for another set of attributes.
- A functional dependency is a generalization of the notion of a key.
Let $R$ be a relation schema

$\alpha \subseteq R$ and $\beta \subseteq R$

The functional dependency

$\alpha \rightarrow \beta$

holds on $R$ if and only if for any legal relations $r(R)$, whenever any two tuples $t_1$ and $t_2$ of $r$ agree on the attributes $\alpha$, they also agree on the attributes $\beta$. That is,

$t_1[\alpha] = t_2[\alpha] \implies t_1[\beta] = t_2[\beta]$

Example: Consider $r(A,B)$ with the following instance of $r$.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this instance, $A \rightarrow B$ does NOT hold, but $B \rightarrow A$ does hold.
Functional Dependencies (Cont.)

- $K$ is a superkey for relation schema $R$ if and only if $K \rightarrow R$
- $K$ is a candidate key for $R$ if and only if
  - $K \rightarrow R$, and
  - for no $\alpha \subset K$, $\alpha \rightarrow R$
- Functional dependencies allow us to express constraints that cannot be expressed using superkeys. Consider the schema:

  $bor\_loan = (\text{customer}\_id, \text{loan}\_number, \text{amount})$.

  We expect this functional dependency to hold:

  $loan\_number \rightarrow amount$

  but would not expect the following to hold:

  $amount \rightarrow customer\_name$
Use of Functional Dependencies

- We use functional dependencies to:
  - test relations to see if they are legal under a given set of functional dependencies.
    - If a relation $r$ is legal under a set $F$ of functional dependencies, we say that $r$ satisfies $F$.
  - specify constraints on the set of legal relations
    - We say that $F$ holds on $R$ if all legal relations on $R$ satisfy the set of functional dependencies $F$.

- Note: A specific instance of a relation schema may satisfy a functional dependency even if the functional dependency does not hold on all legal instances.
  - For example, a specific instance of loan may, by chance, satisfy $amount \rightarrow customer_name$. 
A functional dependency is trivial if it is satisfied by all instances of a relation.

- Example:
  - `customer_name, loan_number → customer_name`
  - `customer_name → customer_name`

- In general, $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is trivial if $\beta \subseteq \alpha$. 
Closure of a Set of Functional Dependencies

- Given a set $F$ set of functional dependencies, there are certain other functional dependencies that are logically implied by $F$.
  - For example: If $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$, then we can infer that $A \rightarrow C$
- The set of all functional dependencies logically implied by $F$ is the closure of $F$.
- We denote the closure of $F$ by $F^+$.
- $F^+$ is a superset of $F$. 
Boyce-Codd Normal Form

A relation schema $R$ is in BCNF with respect to a set $F$ of functional dependencies if for all functional dependencies in $F^+$ of the form

$$\alpha \rightarrow \beta$$

where $\alpha \subseteq R$ and $\beta \subseteq R$, at least one of the following holds:

- $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is trivial (i.e., $\beta \subseteq \alpha$)
- $\alpha$ is a superkey for $R$

Example schema not in BCNF:

bor_loan = ( customer_id, loan_number, amount )

because $loan_number \rightarrow amount$ holds on $bor_loan$ but $loan_number$ is not a superkey
Decomposing a Schema into BCNF

Suppose we have a schema $R$ and a non-trivial dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ causes a violation of BCNF.

We decompose $R$ into:

- $(\alpha \cup \beta)$
- $(R - (\beta - \alpha))$

In our example,

- $\alpha = loan\_number$
- $\beta = amount$

and $bor\_loan$ is replaced by

- $(\alpha \cup \beta) = (loan\_number, amount)$
- $(R - (\beta - \alpha)) = (customer\_id, loan\_number)$
BCNF and Dependency Preservation

- Constraints, including functional dependencies, are costly to check in practice unless they pertain to only one relation.

- If it is sufficient to test only those dependencies on each individual relation of a decomposition in order to ensure that all functional dependencies hold, then that decomposition is dependency preserving.

- Because it is not always possible to achieve both BCNF and dependency preservation, we consider a weaker normal form, known as third normal form.
Third Normal Form

- A relation schema \( R \) is in third normal form (3NF) if for all:
  \[ \alpha \rightarrow \beta \text{ in } F^+ \]
  at least one of the following holds:
  - \( \alpha \rightarrow \beta \) is trivial (i.e., \( \beta \in \alpha \))
  - \( \alpha \) is a superkey for \( R \)
  - Each attribute \( A \) in \( \beta - \alpha \) is contained in a candidate key for \( R \).
    (\textbf{NOTE}: each attribute may be in a different candidate key)

- If a relation is in BCNF it is in 3NF (since in BCNF one of the first two conditions above must hold).

- Third condition is a minimal relaxation of BCNF to ensure dependency preservation (will see why later).
Goals of Normalization

- Let $R$ be a relation scheme with a set $F$ of functional dependencies.
- Decide whether a relation scheme $R$ is in “good” form.
- In the case that a relation scheme $R$ is not in “good” form, decompose it into a set of relation scheme $\{R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n\}$ such that
  - each relation scheme is in good form
  - the decomposition is a lossless-join decomposition
  - Preferably, the decomposition should be dependency preserving.
How good is BCNF?

- There are database schemas in BCNF that do not seem to be sufficiently normalized

- Consider a database

\[ \text{classes (course, teacher, book )} \]

such that \((c, t, b) \in \text{classes}\) means that \(t\) is qualified to teach \(c\), and \(b\) is a required textbook for \(c\)

- The database is supposed to list for each course the set of teachers any one of which can be the course’s instructor, and the set of books, all of which are required for the course (no matter who teaches it).
### How good is BCNF? (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>course</th>
<th>teacher</th>
<th>book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Avi</td>
<td>DB Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Avi</td>
<td>Ullman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Hank</td>
<td>DB Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Hank</td>
<td>Ullman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Sudarshan</td>
<td>DB Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Sudarshan</td>
<td>Ullman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating systems</td>
<td>Avi</td>
<td>OS Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating systems</td>
<td>Avi</td>
<td>Stallings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating systems</td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>OS Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating systems</td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>Stallings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**classes**

- There are no non-trivial functional dependencies and therefore the relation is in BCNF
- Insertion anomalies – i.e., if Marilyn is a new teacher that can teach database, two tuples need to be inserted
  
  (database, Marilyn, DB Concepts)
  
  (database, Marilyn, Ullman)
How good is BCNF? (Cont.)

Therefore, it is better to decompose classes into:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>course</th>
<th>teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Avi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Hank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Sudarshan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating systems</td>
<td>Avi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating systems</td>
<td>Jim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**teaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>course</th>
<th>book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>DB Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>database</td>
<td>Ullman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating systems</td>
<td>OS Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating systems</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This suggests the need for higher normal forms, such as Fourth Normal Form (4NF), which we shall see later.
Functional-Dependency Theory

- We now consider the formal theory that tells us which functional dependencies are implied logically by a given set of functional dependencies.
- We then develop algorithms to generate lossless decompositions into BCNF and 3NF.
- We then develop algorithms to test if a decomposition is dependency-preserving.
Closure of a Set of Functional Dependencies

- Given a set $F$ of functional dependencies, there are certain other functional dependencies that are logically implied by $F$.
  - For example: If $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$, then we can infer that $A \rightarrow C$
- The set of all functional dependencies logically implied by $F$ is the closure of $F$.
- We denote the closure of $F$ by $F^+$.
- We can find all of $F^+$ by applying Armstrong’s Axioms:
  - if $\beta \subseteq \alpha$, then $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ (reflexivity)
  - if $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$, then $\gamma \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \beta$ (augmentation)
  - if $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$, and $\beta \rightarrow \gamma$, then $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ (transitivity)
- These rules are
  - sound (generate only functional dependencies that actually hold) and
  - complete (generate all functional dependencies that hold).
Example

- \( R = \{A, B, C, G, H, I\} \)
  \( F = \{ A \rightarrow B \)
  
  \( A \rightarrow C \)
  
  \( CG \rightarrow H \)
  
  \( CG \rightarrow I \)
  
  \( B \rightarrow H \} \)

- some members of \( F^+ \)
  - \( A \rightarrow H \)
    - by transitivity from \( A \rightarrow B \) and \( B \rightarrow H \)
  - \( AG \rightarrow I \)
    - by augmenting \( A \rightarrow C \) with \( G \), to get \( AG \rightarrow CG \)
      and then transitivity with \( CG \rightarrow I \)
  - \( CG \rightarrow HI \)
    - by augmenting \( CG \rightarrow I \) to infer \( CG \rightarrow CGI \),
      and augmenting of \( CG \rightarrow H \) to infer \( CGI \rightarrow HI \),
      and then transitivity
Procedure for Computing $F^+$

To compute the closure of a set of functional dependencies $F$:

\[ F^+ = F \]

repeat
  for each functional dependency $f$ in $F^+$
    apply reflexivity and augmentation rules on $f$
    add the resulting functional dependencies to $F^+$
  for each pair of functional dependencies $f_1$ and $f_2$ in $F^+$
    if $f_1$ and $f_2$ can be combined using transitivity
      then add the resulting functional dependency to $F^+$
  until $F^+$ does not change any further

NOTE: We shall see an alternative procedure for this task later
We can further simplify manual computation of \( F^+ \) by using the following additional rules.

- If \( \alpha \rightarrow \beta \) holds and \( \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \) holds, then \( \alpha \rightarrow \beta \gamma \) holds (union)
- If \( \alpha \rightarrow \beta \gamma \) holds, then \( \alpha \rightarrow \beta \) holds and \( \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \) holds (decomposition)
- If \( \alpha \rightarrow \beta \) holds and \( \gamma \beta \rightarrow \delta \) holds, then \( \alpha \gamma \rightarrow \delta \) holds (pseudotransitivity)

The above rules can be inferred from Armstrong’s axioms.
Closure of Attribute Sets

- Given a set of attributes \( \alpha \), define the *closure* of \( \alpha \) under \( F \) (denoted by \( \alpha^+ \)) as the set of attributes that are functionally determined by \( \alpha \) under \( F \).

- Algorithm to compute \( \alpha^+ \), the closure of \( \alpha \) under \( F \):

  ```
  result := \alpha;
  while (changes to result) do
    for each \( \beta \rightarrow \gamma \) in \( F \) do
      begin
        if \( \beta \subseteq \text{result} \) then result := result \cup \gamma
      end
  ```
Example of Attribute Set Closure

- \( R = (A, B, C, G, H, I) \)
- \( F = \{ A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C, CG \rightarrow H, CG \rightarrow I, B \rightarrow H \} \)
- \((AG)^+\)
  1. \(\text{result} = AG\)
  2. \(\text{result} = ABCG \quad (A \rightarrow C \text{ and } A \rightarrow B)\)
  3. \(\text{result} = ABCGH \quad (CG \rightarrow H \text{ and } CG \subseteq AGBC)\)
  4. \(\text{result} = ABCGHI \quad (CG \rightarrow I \text{ and } CG \subseteq AGBCH)\)

Is AG a candidate key?
  1. Is AG a super key?
     1. Does \(AG \rightarrow R? \) == Is \((AG)^+ \supseteq R\)
     2. Is any subset of AG a superkey?
        1. Does \(A \rightarrow R? \) == Is \((A)^+ \supseteq R\)
        2. Does \(G \rightarrow R? \) == Is \((G)^+ \supseteq R\)
Uses of Attribute Closure

There are several uses of the attribute closure algorithm:

- **Testing for superkey:**
  - To test if $\alpha$ is a superkey, we compute $\alpha^+$ and check if $\alpha^+$ contains all attributes of $R$.

- **Testing functional dependencies**
  - To check if a functional dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ holds (or, in other words, is in $F^+$), just check if $\beta \subseteq \alpha^+$.
  - That is, we compute $\alpha^+$ by using attribute closure, and then check if it contains $\beta$.
  - Is a simple and cheap test, and very useful

- **Computing closure of F**
  - For each $\gamma \subseteq R$, we find the closure $\gamma^+$, and for each $S \subseteq \gamma^+$, we output a functional dependency $\gamma \rightarrow S$. 
Canonical Cover

- Sets of functional dependencies may have redundant dependencies that can be inferred from the others
  - For example: \( A \rightarrow C \) is redundant in: \( \{ A \rightarrow B, \ B \rightarrow C \} \)
  - Parts of a functional dependency may be redundant
    - E.g.: on RHS: \( \{ A \rightarrow B, \ B \rightarrow C, \ A \rightarrow CD \} \) can be simplified to \( \{ A \rightarrow B, \ B \rightarrow C, \ A \rightarrow D \} \)
    - E.g.: on LHS: \( \{ A \rightarrow B, \ B \rightarrow C, \ AC \rightarrow D \} \) can be simplified to \( \{ A \rightarrow B, \ B \rightarrow C, \ A \rightarrow D \} \)

- Intuitively, a canonical cover of \( F \) is a “minimal” set of functional dependencies equivalent to \( F \), having no redundant dependencies or redundant parts of dependencies
Extraneous Attributes

Consider a set $F$ of functional dependencies and the functional dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ in $F$.

- Attribute $A$ is extraneous in $\alpha$ if $A \in \alpha$ and $F$ logically implies $(F - \{\alpha \rightarrow \beta\}) \cup \{(\alpha - A) \rightarrow \beta\}$.
- Attribute $A$ is extraneous in $\beta$ if $A \in \beta$ and the set of functional dependencies $(F - \{\alpha \rightarrow \beta\}) \cup \{\alpha \rightarrow (\beta - A)\}$ logically implies $F$.

*Note:* implication in the opposite direction is trivial in each of the cases above, since a “stronger” functional dependency always implies a weaker one.

Example: Given $F = \{A \rightarrow C, AB \rightarrow C\}$
- $B$ is extraneous in $AB \rightarrow C$ because $\{A \rightarrow C, AB \rightarrow C\}$ logically implies $A \rightarrow C$ (i.e. the result of dropping $B$ from $AB \rightarrow C$).

Example: Given $F = \{A \rightarrow C, AB \rightarrow CD\}$
- $C$ is extraneous in $AB \rightarrow CD$ since $AB \rightarrow C$ can be inferred even after deleting $C$. 
Testing if an Attribute is Extraneous

Consider a set \( F \) of functional dependencies and the functional dependency \( \alpha \rightarrow \beta \) in \( F \).

To test if attribute \( A \in \alpha \) is extraneous in \( \alpha \)
1. compute \((\{\alpha\} - A)^+\) using the dependencies in \( F \)
2. check that \((\{\alpha\} - A)^+\) contains \( A \); if it does, \( A \) is extraneous

To test if attribute \( A \in \beta \) is extraneous in \( \beta \)
1. compute \( \alpha^+ \) using only the dependencies in
   \[ F' = (F - \{\alpha \rightarrow \beta\}) \cup \{\alpha \rightarrow (\beta - A)\}, \]
2. check that \( \alpha^+ \) contains \( A \); if it does, \( A \) is extraneous
Canonical Cover

- A **canonical cover** for $F$ is a set of dependencies $F_c$ such that
  - $F$ logically implies all dependencies in $F_c$, and
  - $F_c$ logically implies all dependencies in $F$, and
  - No functional dependency in $F_c$ contains an extraneous attribute, and
  - Each left side of functional dependency in $F_c$ is unique.

- To compute a canonical cover for $F$:
  
  repeat
  
  Use the union rule to replace any dependencies in $F$
  
  $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \beta_1$ and $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \beta_2$ with $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \beta_1 \beta_2$
  
  Find a functional dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ with an extraneous attribute either in $\alpha$ or in $\beta$
  
  If an extraneous attribute is found, delete it from $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$
  
  until $F$ does not change

- Note: Union rule may become applicable after some extraneous attributes have been deleted, so it has to be re-applied
Computing a Canonical Cover

- $R = (A, B, C)$
  - $F = \{A \rightarrow BC, B \rightarrow C, A \rightarrow B, AB \rightarrow C\}$

- Combine $A \rightarrow BC$ and $A \rightarrow B$ into $A \rightarrow BC$
  - Set is now $\{A \rightarrow BC, B \rightarrow C, AB \rightarrow C\}$

- $A$ is extraneous in $AB \rightarrow C$
  - Check if the result of deleting $A$ from $AB \rightarrow C$ is implied by the other dependencies
    - Yes: in fact, $B \rightarrow C$ is already present!
  - Set is now $\{A \rightarrow BC, B \rightarrow C\}$

- $C$ is extraneous in $A \rightarrow BC$
  - Check if $A \rightarrow C$ is logically implied by $A \rightarrow B$ and the other dependencies
    - Yes: using transitivity on $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$.
      - Can use attribute closure of $A$ in more complex cases

- The canonical cover is: $A \rightarrow B$
  - $B \rightarrow C$
Lossless-join Decomposition

For the case of $R = (R_1, R_2)$, we require that for all possible relations $r$ on schema $R$

$$r = \prod_{R_1}(r) \ \ \ \ \prod_{R_2}(r)$$

A decomposition of $R$ into $R_1$ and $R_2$ is lossless join if and only if at least one of the following dependencies is in $F^+$:

- $R_1 \cap R_2 \rightarrow R_1$
- $R_1 \cap R_2 \rightarrow R_2$
Example

- \( R = (A, B, C) \)
  \[ F = \{ A \rightarrow B, \ B \rightarrow C \} \]
  
  - Can be decomposed in two different ways

- \( R_1 = (A, B), \ R_2 = (B, C) \)
  
  - Lossless-join decomposition:
    \[ R_1 \cap R_2 = \{B\} \text{ and } B \rightarrow BC \]
  
  - Dependency preserving

- \( R_1 = (A, B), \ R_2 = (A, C) \)
  
  - Lossless-join decomposition:
    \[ R_1 \cap R_2 = \{A\} \text{ and } A \rightarrow AB \]
  
  - Not dependency preserving
    (cannot check \( B \rightarrow C \) without computing \( R_1 \cap R_2 \))
Let $F_i$ be the set of dependencies $F^+$ that include only attributes in $R_i$.

- A decomposition is dependency preserving, if
  \[(F_1 \cup F_2 \cup \ldots \cup F_n)^+ = F^+\]

- If it is not, then checking updates for violation of functional dependencies may require computing joins, which is expensive.
Testing for Dependency Preservation

To check if a dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is preserved in a decomposition of $R$ into $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n$ we apply the following test (with attribute closure done with respect to $F$)

- $result = \alpha$
  - while (changes to $result$) do
    - for each $R_i$ in the decomposition
      - $t = (result \cap R_i)^+ \cap R_i$
      - $result = result \cup t$

- If $result$ contains all attributes in $\beta$, then the functional dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is preserved.

We apply the test on all dependencies in $F$ to check if a decomposition is dependency preserving.

This procedure takes polynomial time, instead of the exponential time required to compute $F^+$ and $(F_1 \cup F_2 \cup \ldots \cup F_n)^+$.
Example

- \( R = (A, B, C) \)
  \[ F = \{ A \rightarrow B, \quad B \rightarrow C \} \]
  Key = \{A\}

- \( R \) is not in BCNF

- Decomposition \( R_1 = (A, B), \quad R_2 = (B, C) \)
  - \( R_1 \) and \( R_2 \) in BCNF
  - Lossless-join decomposition
  - Dependency preserving
Testing for BCNF

To check if a non-trivial dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ causes a violation of BCNF
1. compute $\alpha^+$ (the attribute closure of $\alpha$), and
2. verify that it includes all attributes of $R$, that is, it is a superkey of $R$.

Simplified test: To check if a relation schema $R$ is in BCNF, it suffices to check only the dependencies in the given set $F$ for violation of BCNF, rather than checking all dependencies in $F^+$.

- If none of the dependencies in $F$ causes a violation of BCNF, then none of the dependencies in $F^+$ will cause a violation of BCNF either.

However, using only $F$ is incorrect when testing a relation in a decomposition of $R$

- Consider $R = (A, B, C, D, E)$, with $F = \{ A \rightarrow B, BC \rightarrow D \}$
  - Decompose $R$ into $R_1 = (A,B)$ and $R_2 = (A,C,D, E)$
  - Neither of the dependencies in $F$ contain only attributes from $(A,C,D,E)$ so we might be mislead into thinking $R_2$ satisfies BCNF.
  - In fact, dependency $AC \rightarrow D$ in $F^+$ shows $R_2$ is not in BCNF.
Testing Decomposition for BCNF

To check if a relation $R_i$ in a decomposition of $R$ is in BCNF,

- Either test $R_i$ for BCNF with respect to the restriction of $F$ to $R_i$ (that is, all FDs in $F^+$ that contain only attributes from $R_i$)
- or use the original set of dependencies $F$ that hold on $R$, but with the following test:
  - for every set of attributes $\alpha \subseteq R_i$, check that $\alpha^+$ (the attribute closure of $\alpha$) either includes no attribute of $R_i - \alpha$, or includes all attributes of $R_i$.

  ▶ If the condition is violated by some $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ in $F$, the dependency $\alpha \rightarrow (\alpha^+ - \alpha) \cap R_i$
  can be shown to hold on $R_i$, and $R_i$ violates BCNF.

  ▶ We use above dependency to decompose $R_i$
BCNF Decomposition Algorithm

\[
\text{result} := \{ R \}; \\
\text{done} := \text{false}; \\
\text{compute } F^+; \\
\text{while (not done) do} \\
\quad \text{if (there is a schema } R_i \text{ in result that is not in BCNF)} \\
\quad \quad \text{then begin} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{let } \alpha \to \beta \text{ be a nontrivial functional dependency that holds on } R_i \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{such that } \alpha \to R_i \text{ is not in } F^+, \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{and } \alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset; \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{result} := (\text{result} - R_i) \cup (R_i - \beta) \cup (\alpha, \beta); \\
\quad \quad \text{end} \\
\quad \text{else done} := \text{true}; \\
\]

Note: each \( R_i \) is in BCNF, and decomposition is lossless-join.
Example of BCNF Decomposition

- \( R = (A, B, C) \)
  \[ F = \{ A \rightarrow B, \quad B \rightarrow C \} \]
  Key = \{A\}

- \( R \) is not in BCNF (\( B \rightarrow C \) but \( B \) is not superkey)

- Decomposition
  - \( R_1 = (B, C) \)
  - \( R_2 = (A, B) \)
Example of BCNF Decomposition

Original relation $R$ and functional dependency $F$

\[ R = (\text{branch\_name}, \text{branch\_city}, \text{assets}, \text{customer\_name}, \text{loan\_number}, \text{amount}) \]

\[ F = \{ \text{branch\_name} \rightarrow \text{assets} \text{ branch\_city} \text{ loan\_number} \rightarrow \text{amount} \text{ branch\_name} \} \]

Key = \{loan\_number, customer\_name\}

Decomposition

- $R_1 = (\text{branch\_name}, \text{branch\_city}, \text{assets})$
- $R_2 = (\text{branch\_name}, \text{customer\_name}, \text{loan\_number}, \text{amount})$
- $R_3 = (\text{branch\_name}, \text{loan\_number}, \text{amount})$
- $R_4 = (\text{customer\_name}, \text{loan\_number})$

Final decomposition

\[ R_1, R_3, R_4 \]
It is not always possible to get a BCNF decomposition that is dependency preserving.

- $R = (J, K, L)$
  - $F = \{JK \rightarrow L, L \rightarrow K\}$
  - Two candidate keys = $JK$ and $JL$

- $R$ is not in BCNF

- Any decomposition of $R$ will fail to preserve $JK \rightarrow L$

  This implies that testing for $JK \rightarrow L$ requires a join.
Third Normal Form: Motivation

- There are some situations where
  - BCNF is not dependency preserving, and
  - efficient checking for FD violation on updates is important
- Solution: define a weaker normal form, called Third Normal Form (3NF)
  - Allows some redundancy (with resultant problems; we will see examples later)
  - But functional dependencies can be checked on individual relations without computing a join.
  - There is always a lossless-join, dependency-preserving decomposition into 3NF.
3NF Example

Relation R:
- \( R = (J, K, L) \)
- \( F = \{JK \rightarrow L, L \rightarrow K\} \)
- Two candidate keys: JK and JL
- \( R \) is in 3NF
  - \( JK \rightarrow L \)
  - JK is a superkey
  - \( L \rightarrow K \)
  - \( K \) is contained in a candidate key
Redundancy in 3NF

- There is some redundancy in this schema
- Example of problems due to redundancy in 3NF
  - \( R = (J, K, L) \)
  - \( F = \{JK \rightarrow L, L \rightarrow K\} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(j_1)</td>
<td>(l_1)</td>
<td>(k_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j_2)</td>
<td>(l_1)</td>
<td>(k_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j_3)</td>
<td>(l_1)</td>
<td>(k_1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>null</td>
<td>(l_2)</td>
<td>(k_2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- repetition of information (e.g., the relationship \(l_1, k_1\))
- need to use null values (e.g., to represent the relationship \(l_2, k_2\) where there is no corresponding value for \(J\)).
Testing for 3NF

- Optimization: Need to check only FDs in $F$, need not check all FDs in $F^+$. 

- Use attribute closure to check for each dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$, if $\alpha$ is a superkey.

- If $\alpha$ is not a superkey, we have to verify if each attribute in $\beta$ is contained in a candidate key of $R$:
  - this test is rather more expensive, since it involve finding candidate keys
  - testing for 3NF has been shown to be NP-hard
  - Interestingly, decomposition into third normal form (described shortly) can be done in polynomial time
3NF Decomposition Algorithm

Let $F_c$ be a canonical cover for $F$;

\( i := 0; \)

\textbf{for each} functional dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ in $F_c$ \textbf{do}

\quad \text{if none of the schemas } R_j, \ 1 \leq j \leq i \text{ contains } \alpha \ \beta

\quad \quad \text{then begin}

\quad \quad \quad i := i + 1;

\quad \quad \quad R_i := \alpha \ \beta

\quad \quad \text{end}

\quad \text{if none of the schemas } R_j, \ 1 \leq j \leq i \text{ contains a candidate key for } R

\quad \quad \text{then begin}

\quad \quad \quad i := i + 1;

\quad \quad \quad R_i := \text{any candidate key for } R;

\quad \text{end}

\textbf{return} \ (R_1, R_2, ..., R_i)
3NF Decomposition Algorithm (Cont.)

- Above algorithm ensures:
  - each relation schema $R_i$ is in 3NF
  - decomposition is dependency preserving and lossless-join
  - Proof of correctness is at end of this file (click here)
Example

- Relation schema:
  
  \[ \text{cust_banker_branch} = (\text{customer_id, employee_id, branch_name, type}) \]

- The functional dependencies for this relation schema are:
  
  \[ \text{customer_id, employee_id} \rightarrow \text{branch_name, type} \]
  
  \[ \text{employee_id} \rightarrow \text{branch_name} \]

- The for loop generates:
  
  \[ (\text{customer_id, employee_id, branch_name, type}) \]

It then generates

\[ (\text{employee_id, branch_name}) \]

but does not include it in the decomposition because it is a subset of the first schema.
Comparison of BCNF and 3NF

- It is always possible to decompose a relation into a set of relations that are in 3NF such that:
  - the decomposition is lossless
  - the dependencies are preserved

- It is always possible to decompose a relation into a set of relations that are in BCNF such that:
  - the decomposition is lossless
  - it may not be possible to preserve dependencies.
Design Goals

- Goal for a relational database design is:
  - BCNF.
  - Lossless join.
  - Dependency preservation.

- If we cannot achieve this, we accept one of
  - Lack of dependency preservation
  - Redundancy due to use of 3NF

- Interestingly, SQL does not provide a direct way of specifying functional dependencies other than superkeys.

  Can specify FDs using assertions, but they are expensive to test

- Even if we had a dependency preserving decomposition, using SQL we would not be able to efficiently test a functional dependency whose left hand side is not a key.
Multivalued Dependencies (MVDs)

Let $R$ be a relation schema and let $\alpha \subseteq R$ and $\beta \subseteq R$. The multivalued dependency

$$\alpha \rightarrow \rightarrow \beta$$

holds on $R$ if in any legal relation $r(R)$, for all pairs for tuples $t_1$ and $t_2$ in $r$ such that $t_1[\alpha] = t_2[\alpha]$, there exist tuples $t_3$ and $t_4$ in $r$ such that:

$$t_1[\alpha] = t_2[\alpha] = t_3[\alpha] = t_4[\alpha]$$
$$t_3[\beta] = t_1[\beta]$$
$$t_3[R - \beta] = t_2[R - \beta]$$
$$t_4[\beta] = t_2[\beta]$$
$$t_4[R - \beta] = t_1[R - \beta]$$
MVD (Cont.)

- Tabular representation of $\alpha \rightarrow\rightarrow \beta$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R - \alpha - \beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$t_1$</td>
<td>$a_1 \ldots a_i$</td>
<td>$a_i + 1 \ldots a_j$</td>
<td>$a_j + 1 \ldots a_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_2$</td>
<td>$a_1 \ldots a_i$</td>
<td>$b_i + 1 \ldots b_j$</td>
<td>$b_j + 1 \ldots b_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_3$</td>
<td>$a_1 \ldots a_i$</td>
<td>$a_i + 1 \ldots a_j$</td>
<td>$b_j + 1 \ldots b_n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_4$</td>
<td>$a_1 \ldots a_i$</td>
<td>$b_i + 1 \ldots b_j$</td>
<td>$a_j + 1 \ldots a_n$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example

- Let $R$ be a relation schema with a set of attributes that are partitioned into 3 nonempty subsets.
  \[ Y, Z, W \]

- We say that $Y \rightarrow\rightarrow Z$ (\(Y\) multidetermines \(Z\)) if and only if for all possible relations $r$ (\(R\))
  \[ < y_1, z_1, w_1 > \in r \text{ and } < y_2, z_2, w_2 > \in r \]
  then
  \[ < y_1, z_1, w_2 > \in r \text{ and } < y_2, z_2, w_1 > \in r \]

- Note that since the behavior of $Z$ and $W$ are identical it follows that
  $Y \rightarrow\rightarrow Z$ if $Y \rightarrow\rightarrow W$
Example (Cont.)

- In our example:
  
  \[\text{course} \rightarrow\rightarrow \text{teacher}\]
  \[\text{course} \rightarrow\rightarrow \text{book}\]

- The above formal definition is supposed to formalize the notion that given a particular value of \( Y \) (course) it has associated with it a set of values of \( Z \) (teacher) and a set of values of \( W \) (book), and these two sets are in some sense independent of each other.

- Note:
  
  - If \( Y \rightarrow Z \) then \( Y \rightarrow\rightarrow Z \)
  
  - Indeed we have (in above notation) \( Z_1 = Z_2 \)
    The claim follows.
We use multivalued dependencies in two ways:

1. To test relations to determine whether they are legal under a given set of functional and multivalued dependencies.

2. To specify constraints on the set of legal relations. We shall thus concern ourselves only with relations that satisfy a given set of functional and multivalued dependencies.

If a relation $r$ fails to satisfy a given multivalued dependency, we can construct a relation $r'$ that does satisfy the multivalued dependency by adding tuples to $r$. 
From the definition of multivalued dependency, we can derive the following rule:

- If \( \alpha \rightarrow \beta \), then \( \alpha \rightarrow \rightarrow \beta \)

That is, every functional dependency is also a multivalued dependency.

The closure \( D^+ \) of \( D \) is the set of all functional and multivalued dependencies logically implied by \( D \).

- We can compute \( D^+ \) from \( D \), using the formal definitions of functional dependencies and multivalued dependencies.
- We can manage with such reasoning for very simple multivalued dependencies, which seem to be most common in practice.
- For complex dependencies, it is better to reason about sets of dependencies using a system of inference rules (see Appendix C).
Fourth Normal Form

A relation schema $R$ is in 4NF with respect to a set $D$ of functional and multivalued dependencies if for all multivalued dependencies in $D^+$ of the form $\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta$, where $\alpha \subseteq R$ and $\beta \subseteq R$, at least one of the following hold:

- $\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta$ is trivial (i.e., $\beta \subseteq \alpha$ or $\alpha \cup \beta = R$)
- $\alpha$ is a superkey for schema $R$

If a relation is in 4NF it is in BCNF
Restriction of Multivalued Dependencies

The restriction of $D$ to $R_i$ is the set $D_i$ consisting of

- All functional dependencies in $D^+$ that include only attributes of $R_i$
- All multivalued dependencies of the form
  
  $\alpha \rightarrow (\beta \cap R_i)$

  where $\alpha \subseteq R_i$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is in $D^+$
4NF Decomposition Algorithm

result: = \{R\};
done := false;
compute D+;
Let D_i denote the restriction of D+ to \( R_i \)

while (not done)
  if (there is a schema \( R_i \) in result that is not in 4NF) then
    begin
      let \( \alpha \rightarrow\rightarrow \beta \) be a nontrivial multivalued dependency that holds
      on \( R_i \) such that \( \alpha \rightarrow R_i \) is not in \( D_i \), and \( \alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset \);
      result := (result - \( R_i \)) \cup (R_i - \beta) \cup (\alpha, \beta);
    end
  else done := true;

Note: each \( R_i \) is in 4NF, and decomposition is lossless-join
Example

- \( R = (A, B, C, G, H, I) \)
  \[ F = \{ A \rightarrow B, \quad B \rightarrow HI, \quad CG \rightarrow H \} \]

- \( R \) is not in 4NF since \( A \rightarrow B \) and \( A \) is not a superkey for \( R \)

- Decomposition
  a) \( R_1 = (A, B) \)  \( (R_1 \) is in 4NF\)
  b) \( R_2 = (A, C, G, H, I) \)  \( (R_2 \) is not in 4NF\)
  c) \( R_3 = (C, G, H) \)  \( (R_3 \) is in 4NF\)
  d) \( R_4 = (A, C, G, I) \)  \( (R_4 \) is not in 4NF\)
  e) \( R_5 = (A, I) \)  \( (R_5 \) is in 4NF\)
  f) \( R_6 = (A, C, G) \)  \( (R_6 \) is in 4NF\)

- Since \( A \rightarrow B \) and \( B \rightarrow HI, A \rightarrow HI, A \rightarrow I \)
Further Normal Forms

- **Join dependencies** generalize multivalued dependencies
  - lead to **project-join normal form** (PJNF) (also called **fifth normal form**)
- A class of even more general constraints, leads to a normal form called **domain-key normal form**.
- Problem with these generalized constraints: are hard to reason with, and no set of sound and complete set of inference rules exists.
- Hence rarely used
Overall Database Design Process

- We have assumed schema $R$ is given
  - $R$ could have been generated when converting E-R diagram to a set of tables.
  - $R$ could have been a single relation containing all attributes that are of interest (called universal relation).
  - Normalization breaks $R$ into smaller relations.
  - $R$ could have been the result of some ad hoc design of relations, which we then test/convert to normal form.
ER Model and Normalization

- When an E-R diagram is carefully designed, identifying all entities correctly, the tables generated from the E-R diagram should not need further normalization.

- However, in a real (imperfect) design, there can be functional dependencies from non-key attributes of an entity to other attributes of the entity
  - Example: an employee entity with attributes $\text{department\_number}$ and $\text{department\_address}$, and a functional dependency $\text{department\_number} \rightarrow \text{department\_address}$
  - Good design would have made department an entity

- Functional dependencies from non-key attributes of a relationship set possible, but rare --- most relationships are binary
Denormalization for Performance

- May want to use non-normalized schema for performance
- For example, displaying `customer_name` along with `account_number` and `balance` requires join of `account` with `depositor`
- Alternative 1: Use denormalized relation containing attributes of `account` as well as `depositor` with all above attributes
  - faster lookup
  - extra space and extra execution time for updates
  - extra coding work for programmer and possibility of error in extra code
- Alternative 2: use a materialized view defined as `account ⋈ depositor`
  - Benefits and drawbacks same as above, except no extra coding work for programmer and avoids possible errors
Other Design Issues

- Some aspects of database design are not caught by normalization
- Examples of bad database design, to be avoided:
  - Instead of `earnings (company_id, year, amount )`, use
      - Above are in BCNF, but make querying across years difficult and needs new table each year
      - Also in BCNF, but also makes querying across years difficult and requires new attribute each year.
      - Is an example of a crosstab, where values for one attribute become column names
      - Used in spreadsheets, and in data analysis tools
Temporal data have an association time interval during which the data are valid.

A snapshot is the value of the data at a particular point in time.

Adding a temporal component results in functional dependencies like

\[ \text{customer_id} \rightarrow \text{customer_street}, \text{customer_city} \]

not to hold, because the address varies over time.

A temporal functional dependency holds on schema \( R \) if the corresponding functional dependency holds on all snapshots for all legal instances \( r (R) \).
End of Chapter
Proof of Correctness of 3NF Decomposition Algorithm
Correctness of 3NF Decomposition Algorithm

- 3NF decomposition algorithm is dependency preserving (since there is a relation for every FD in $F_c$)
- Decomposition is lossless
  - A candidate key ($C$) is in one of the relations $R_i$ in decomposition
  - Closure of candidate key under $F_c$ must contain all attributes in $R$.
  - Follow the steps of attribute closure algorithm to show there is only one tuple in the join result for each tuple in $R_i$
Claim: if a relation $R_i$ is in the decomposition generated by the above algorithm, then $R_i$ satisfies 3NF.

- Let $R_i$ be generated from the dependency $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$
- Let $\gamma \rightarrow B$ be any non-trivial functional dependency on $R_i$. (We need only consider FDs whose right-hand side is a single attribute.)
- Now, $B$ can be in either $\beta$ or $\alpha$ but not in both. Consider each case separately.
Correctness of 3NF Decomposition (Cont’d.)

- Case 1: If $B$ in $\beta$:
  - If $\gamma$ is a superkey, the 2nd condition of 3NF is satisfied
  - Otherwise $\alpha$ must contain some attribute not in $\gamma$
  - Since $\gamma \rightarrow B$ is in $F^+$ it must be derivable from $F_c$, by using attribute closure on $\gamma$.
  - Attribute closure not have used $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$. If it had been used, $\alpha$ must be contained in the attribute closure of $\gamma$, which is not possible, since we assumed $\gamma$ is not a superkey.
  - Now, using $\alpha \rightarrow (\beta - \{B\})$ and $\gamma \rightarrow B$, we can derive $\alpha \rightarrow B$
    (since $\gamma \subseteq \alpha \beta$, and $B \notin \gamma$ since $\gamma \rightarrow B$ is non-trivial)
  - Then, $B$ is extraneous in the right-hand side of $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$; which is not possible since $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is in $F_c$.
  - Thus, if $B$ is in $\beta$ then $\gamma$ must be a superkey, and the second condition of 3NF must be satisfied.
Correctness of 3NF Decomposition (Cont’d.)

- Case 2: $B$ is in $\alpha$.
  - Since $\alpha$ is a candidate key, the third alternative in the definition of 3NF is trivially satisfied.
  - In fact, we cannot show that $\gamma$ is a superkey.
  - This shows exactly why the third alternative is present in the definition of 3NF.

Q.E.D.
Figure 7.5: Sample Relation \( r \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( a_1 )</td>
<td>( b_1 )</td>
<td>( c_1 )</td>
<td>( d_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>( a_1 )</td>
<td>( b_2 )</td>
<td>( c_1 )</td>
<td>( d_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>( a_2 )</td>
<td>( b_2 )</td>
<td>( c_2 )</td>
<td>( d_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>( a_2 )</td>
<td>( b_3 )</td>
<td>( c_2 )</td>
<td>( d_3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>( a_3 )</td>
<td>( b_3 )</td>
<td>( c_2 )</td>
<td>( d_4 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.15: An Example of Redundancy in a BCNF Relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>loan_number</th>
<th>customer_id</th>
<th>customer_street</th>
<th>customer_city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-23</td>
<td>99-123</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Rye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-23</td>
<td>99-123</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-93</td>
<td>15-106</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Horseneck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.16: An Illegal $R_2$ Relation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>loan_number</th>
<th>customer_id</th>
<th>customer_street</th>
<th>customer_city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-23</td>
<td>99-123</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Rye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-27</td>
<td>99-123</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.18: Relation of Practice

Exercise 7.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>$c_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>$c_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>$c_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>$c_3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>