

# CSE 414: Section 4

# Relational Algebra

# Datalog

October 18th, 2018

# RA Operators

$\cap$  - Intersect

$$R1 \cap R2 = R1 - (R1 - R2)$$

$$R1 \cap R2 = R1 \bowtie R2$$

Standard:

$\cup$  - Union

$-$  - Diff.

$\sigma$  - Select

$\pi$  - Project

$\rho$  - Rename

Joins:

$\bowtie$  - Nat. Join

$\bowtie_{\text{L.O.}}$  - L.O. Join

$\bowtie_{\text{R.O.}}$  - R.O. Join

$\bowtie_{\text{F.O.}}$  - F.O. Join

$\times$  - Cross Product

Extended:

$\delta$  - Duplicate Elim.

$\gamma$  - Group/Agg.

$\tau$  - Sorting

# A Few More SQL Keywords

(<sub>) INTERSECT (<sub>)

(<sub>) UNION (<sub>)

(<sub>) EXCEPT (<sub>)

# Y Notation

Grouping and aggregation on group:

$\Upsilon_{\text{attr}_1, \dots, \text{attr}_k, \text{count/sum/max/min}(\text{attr})} \rightarrow \text{alias}$

Aggregation on the entire table:

$\Upsilon_{\text{count/sum/max/min}(\text{attr})} \rightarrow \text{alias}$

# Query Plans (Example SQL -> RA)

Select-Join-Project structure

Make this SQL query into RA (remember FWGHOS):

```
SELECT R.b, T.c, max(T.a) AS T_max
  FROM Table_R AS R, Table_T AS T
 WHERE R.b = T.b
  GROUP BY R.b, T.c
HAVING max(T.a) > 99
```

# Query Plans (Example SQL -> RA)

Select-Join-Project structure

Make this SQL query into RA (remember FWGHOS):

```
SELECT R.b, T.c, max(T.a) AS T_max
  FROM Table_R AS R, Table_T AS T
 WHERE R.b = T.b
  GROUP BY R.b, T.c
HAVING max(T.a) > 99
```

$\pi_{R.b, T.c, T_{max}}(\sigma_{T_{max} > 99}(\gamma_{R.b, T.c, \max(T.a) \rightarrow T_{max}}(R \bowtie_{R.b=T.b} T)))$

# Datalog



# Datalog Terminology

Head - Body - Atom/Subgoal/Relational predicate

Base Relations (EDB) vs Derived Relations (IDB)

- Negation + Aggregate

Wildcard

```
Helper(a,b):-Base1(a,b,_)
```

```
NonAns(j):-Base2(j,k),!Base3(k)
```

```
Ans(x):-Helper(x,y),!NonAns(y)
```



# Query Safety

Need a positive relational atom of every variable

What's wrong with this query?

Find all of Alice's children without children:

```
U(x) :- ParentChild("Alice", x), !ParentChild(x, y)
```

# Query Safety

```
U(x) :- ParentChild("Alice",x), !ParentChild(x,y)
```

It is domain dependent! Unsafe!

Double negation to the rescue. Why does this work?

```
NonAns(x) :- ParentChild("Alice",x), ParentChild(x,y)
```

```
# All of Alice's children with children
```

```
U(x) :- ParentChild("Alice",x), !NonAns(x)
```

```
# All of Alice's children without children (safe!)
```

But we can do better...

# Query Safety

But we can do better...

```
hasChild(x) :- ParentChild(x,_)
# People with children
U(x) :- ParentChild("Alice",x), !hasChild(x)
# All of Alice's children without children (safe!)
```

# Datalog with Recursion

Able to write complicated queries in a few lines

Graph analysis

Done with query once output does not change.

# Stratified Datalog

Recursion might not work well with negation

E.g.

```
A(x) :- Table(x), !B(x)
```

```
B(x) :- Table(x), !A(x)
```

Solution: Don't negate or aggregate on an IDB predicate until it is defined  
Stratified Datalog Query

# Stratified Datalog

Only IDB predicates defined in strata 1, 2, ..., n may appear under ! or agg in stratum n+1

