## Introduction to Database Systems CSE 444

Lectures 8 \& 9
Database Design
April 16 \& 18, 2008

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


## Outline

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


## First Normal Form (1NF)

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


## Student

Student

| Name | GPA | Courses |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | Math |$\quad$| Alice | 3.8 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Bob | 3.7 |
| Carol | 3.9 |



## Relational Schema Design



## 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 = repeated data
- Update anomalies $=$ Fred moves to "Bellevue"
- Deletion anomalies $=$ Joe deletes his phone number:
what is his city? 7


## Data Anomalies

When a database is poorly designed we get anomalies:
Redundancy: data is repeated

Update anomalies: need to change in several places

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

## Relation Decomposition

Break the relation into two:

|  | Name <br> Fred <br> Fred <br> Joe | SSN | PhoneNumber | City |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 123-45-6789 | 206-555-1234 |  |
|  |  | 123-45-6789 | 206-555-6543 |  |
|  |  | 987-65-4321 | 908-555-2121 |  |
| 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 |
|  | are go |  | 987-65-4321 | 908-555-2121 |

Anomalies are gone:

- No more repeated data
- Easy to move Fred to "Bellevue" (how?)
- Easy to delete all Joe's phone numbers (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:
$\forall t, t^{\prime} \in R,\left(t . A_{1}=t^{\prime} . A_{1} \wedge \ldots \wedge t . A_{m}=t^{\prime} . A_{m} \Rightarrow t \cdot B_{1}=t^{\prime} . B_{1} \wedge \ldots \wedge t . B_{n}=t^{\prime} . B_{n}\right)$


## 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

| 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

$\xrightarrow{\rightarrow}$

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

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


## Example

FD's are constraints:

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

Does this instance satisfy all the FDs ?


## An Interesting Observation

| If all these FDs are true: | name $\rightarrow$ color <br> category $\rightarrow$ department <br> color, category $\rightarrow$ 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

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

## Armstrong's Rules (1/3)

```
A},\mp@subsup{A}{2}{},\ldots,\mp@subsup{A}{n}{}->\mp@subsup{A}{i}{}\quad\mathrm{ Trivial Rule
    where i = 1, 2, ..,n
```



21

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?

## Example (continued)

| Start from the following FDs: | 1. name $\rightarrow$ color <br> 2. category $\rightarrow$ department <br> 3. color, category $\rightarrow$ price |
| :--- | :--- |
| Infer 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 |  |



## 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: | name $\rightarrow$ color <br> category $\rightarrow$ department <br> color, category $\rightarrow$ price |
| :---: | :--- |
| Closures: |  |

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

## Closure Algorithm

```
X={A1,\ldots,An}.
Repeat until X doesn't change do:
    if }\mp@subsup{B}{1}{},\ldots,\mp@subsup{B}{n}{}->C\mathrm{ is a FD and
        B},\ldots,\mp@subsup{B}{n}{}\mathrm{ are all in X
    then add C to X
{name, category}}\mp@subsup{}{}{+}
            { name, category, color, department, price }
Hence:

\section*{Example}

In class:
\[
\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{~F})
\]
\[
\begin{array}{|lll|}
\hline \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{~B} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{C} \\
\mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{D} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{E} \\
\mathrm{~B} & & \rightarrow \\
\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{D} \\
\mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~F} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{~B} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
\(\left.\begin{array}{ll}\text { Compute }\{\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}\}^{+} & \mathrm{X}=\{\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B},\end{array}\right\}\)

\section*{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 \(\mathrm{A} \in \mathrm{X}^{+}\)

\section*{Using Closure to Infer ALL FDs}

Example:
\[
\begin{array}{|lll|}
\hline \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{~B} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{C} \\
\mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{D} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{~B} \\
\mathrm{~B} & \rightarrow & \mathrm{D} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Step 1: Compute \(\mathrm{X}^{+}\), for every X :
\(\mathrm{A}+=\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}+=\mathrm{BD}, \mathrm{C}+=\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}+=\mathrm{D}\)
\(\mathrm{AB}+=\mathrm{ABCD}, \mathrm{AC}+=\mathrm{AC}, \mathrm{AD}+=\mathrm{ABCD}\),
\[
\mathrm{BC}+=\mathrm{BCD}, \mathrm{BD}+=\mathrm{BD}, \mathrm{CD}+=\mathrm{CD}
\]
\(\mathrm{ABC}+=\mathrm{ABD}+=\mathrm{ACD}^{+}=\mathrm{ABCD}\) (no need to compute- why ?) \(\mathrm{BCD}^{+}=\mathrm{BCD}, \quad \mathrm{ABCD}+=\mathrm{ABCD}\)

Step 2: Enumerate all FD's \(\mathrm{X} \rightarrow \mathrm{Y}\), s.t. \(\mathrm{Y} \subseteq \mathrm{X}^{+}\)and \(\mathrm{X} \cap \mathrm{Y}=\varnothing\) : \(\mathrm{AB} \rightarrow \mathrm{CD}, \mathrm{AD} \rightarrow \mathrm{BC}, \mathrm{ABC} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{ABD} \rightarrow \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{ACD} \rightarrow \mathrm{B} \quad 30\)

\section*{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]

\section*{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

\section*{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

\section*{Example}

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

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

```

What is the key?

\section*{Example}

Product(name, price, category, color)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { name, category } \rightarrow \text { price } \\
& \text { category } \rightarrow \text { color } \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
\]
(find keys at home)

\section*{Examples of Keys}

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

student }->\mathrm{ address

```
student }->\mathrm{ address
room, time }->\mathrm{ course
room, time }->\mathrm{ course
student, course }->\mathrm{ room, time
```

student, course }->\mathrm{ room, time

```

\section*{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

\section*{Example}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline Name & SSN & PhoneNumber & City \\
\hline Fred & \(123-45-6789\) & \(206-555-1234\) & Seattle \\
\hline Fred & \(123-45-6789\) & \(206-555-6543\) & Seattle \\
\hline Joe & \(987-65-4321\) & \(908-555-2121\) & Westfield \\
\hline Joe & \(987-65-4321\) & \(908-555-1234\) & Westfield \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

SSN \(\rightarrow\) Name, City

What the key?
\{SSN, PhoneNumber\} Hence SSN \(\rightarrow\) Name, City is a "bad" dependency 38

\section*{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

\section*{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

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

\section*{Boyce-Codd Normal Form}

A simple condition for removing anomalies from relations:
```

A relation R is in BCNF if:
If }\mp@subsup{A}{1}{},···,\mp@subsup{A}{n}{}->B\mathrm{ is a non-trivial dependency
in R, then {\mp@subsup{A}{1}{},···,\mp@subsup{A}{n}{}}\mathrm{ is a superkey for R}

```

In other words: there are no "bad" FDs

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

\section*{BCNF Decomposition Algorithm}

\section*{repeat}
choose \(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{m} \rightarrow B_{1}, \ldots, B_{n}\) that violates \(B N C F\)
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 \(R_{1}\) and \(R_{2}\)
until no more violations


\section*{Example}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline Name & SSN & PhoneNumber & City \\
\hline Fred & \(123-45-6789\) & \(206-555-1234\) & Seattle \\
\hline Fred & \(123-45-6789\) & \(206-555-6543\) & Seattle \\
\hline Joe & \(987-65-4321\) & \(908-555-2121\) & Westfield \\
\hline Joe & \(987-65-4321\) & \(908-555-1234\) & Westfield \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{SSN \(\rightarrow\) Name, City}

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

\section*{Example}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline Name & SSN & City \\
\cline { 1 - 2 } Fred & \(123-45-6789\) & Seattle \\
\hline JSN \(\rightarrow\) Name, City \\
\hline Joe & \(987-65-4321\) & Westfield \\
& &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline SSN & PhoneNumber \\
\hline \(123-45-6789\) & \(206-555-1234\) \\
\hline \(123-45-6789\) & \(206-555-6543\) \\
\hline \(987-65-4321\) & \(908-555-2121\) \\
\hline \(987-65-4321\) & \(908-555-1234\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Let's check anomalies:
- Redundancy?
- Update ?
- Delete?

\section*{Example Decomposition}

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

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

\section*{Example BCNF Decomposition}

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

\section*{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)
47

\section*{BCNF Decomposition Algorithm}

\section*{BCNF_Decompose(R)}
find X s.t.: \(\mathrm{X} \neq \mathrm{X}^{+} \neq[\)all attributes \(]\)
if (not found) then " \(R\) is in BCNF"
let \(\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{X}^{+}\)- 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


What happens if in R we first pick \(\mathrm{B}^{+}\)? Or \(\mathrm{AB}_{48}^{+}\)?


\section*{Theory of Decomposition}
- Sometimes it is correct:


Lossless decomposition

\section*{Incorrect Decomposition}
- Sometimes it is not:


\section*{Decompositions in General}

```

If }\mp@subsup{\textrm{A}}{1}{},···,\mp@subsup{\textrm{A}}{\textrm{n}}{}->\mp@subsup{\textrm{B}}{1}{},···,\mp@subsup{B}{m}{
Then the decomposition is lossless

```

Note: don't need \(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n} \rightarrow C_{1}, \ldots, C_{p}\)```

