

Q-22.

Aman Varshney (B2179), Akash Kumar (B21272)

Adarsh Samtaria (B21176), Mayank Bihani (B19173), Pratiksha Jain (B19185)

Camlin Page

Date / /

Q-1. A FD  $X \rightarrow Y$  require that the value of  $X$  uniquely determines the value of  $Y$  where  $X$  and  $Y$  are set of attributes.

Option (A) holds functional dependency (FD) as column

A uniquely determine the value of BC.

option (B) doesn't hold functional dependency as for the same (AZ) value there is two different values that's are 7 and 5.

Similarly option (C) doesn't hold FD while (D) holds FD.

- ③ A EMP-NO  
 B EMP-COUNTRY  
 C EMP-DEPT  
 D DEPT-TYPE  
 E EMP-DEPT-NO

- a)  $A \rightarrow B$   
 $A \rightarrow D$   
 $B \rightarrow D$  {  $D \rightarrow B$  makes more sense from a logical view }  
 $C \rightarrow E$

- b) Candidate keys  
 $(A, E)$  and  $(A, C)$  can be candidate keys.

- c) Table is already 1NF (no multivalued attributes)

Removing 2NF issues

| A   | E   |
|-----|-----|
| 264 | 283 |
| 364 | 232 |
| 264 | 300 |
| 364 | 549 |

| A   | B     | D    |
|-----|-------|------|
| 264 | India | 0394 |
| 364 | UK    | 0283 |

| C          | E   |
|------------|-----|
| Designing  | 283 |
| Testing    | 300 |
| Stores     | 232 |
| Developing | 549 |

3NF can be violated by B and C as both give unique values for each other and both are non-prime attributes.

Removing 3NF discrepancies

| A   | E   |
|-----|-----|
| 264 | 283 |
| 364 | 232 |
| 264 | 300 |
| 364 | 549 |

| C          | E   |
|------------|-----|
| Designing  | 283 |
| Testing    | 300 |
| Stores     | 232 |
| Developing | 549 |

| A   | B     |
|-----|-------|
| 264 | India |
| 364 | UK    |

  

| A   | D    |
|-----|------|
| 264 | 0394 |
| 364 | 0283 |

All candidate keys are determining  
 non-prime attributes have in 3NF too and  
 in BCNF



Q-3) Car - Sale (car-id, option-type, option-listprice, sale-date, option-discountedprice).

car-id  $\rightarrow$  sale-date

option-type  $\rightarrow$  option-listprice car-id

option-type  $\rightarrow$  option-discountedprice

\*  $A \rightarrow B$ , B must be prime attribute or A is Superkey.

But in this question:-

car-id, option-type are Prime Attributes

option-listprice, sale-date, option-discountedprice are Non-prime attributes.

$\therefore$  On Right side FD's  $\rightarrow$  All attributes are Non-prime and on left side FD's  $\rightarrow$  Not Superkeys.

So the rel<sup>n</sup> is not in 3F.

Cond<sup>n</sup> for 2NF  $\Rightarrow$  NO Partial Dependency.

~~$\Rightarrow$  Here option-listprice~~

$\Rightarrow$  option-type  $\rightarrow$  option-listprice  $\Rightarrow$  option-listprice is determined only using option-type. ~~and~~

$\therefore$  Not in 2NF.

$$4/ \textcircled{1} AB \rightarrow C$$

$$C \rightarrow EF$$

$$\Rightarrow AB \rightarrow EF$$

$$\textcircled{2} C \rightarrow EF$$

$$C \rightarrow CF$$

$$CF \rightarrow G$$

$$\Rightarrow AB \rightarrow G$$

(a) Hence AB is the candidate key.

(b) CEFH is non-prime attribute.

$$(c) \text{ No. of superkeys} = 2^{n-k}$$

$$= 16 \quad (n=6)$$

$$(d) \text{ No. of superkeys} = 16$$

Superkeys :  $[A, B], [A, B, C], [A, B, E], [A, B, F], [A, B, G], [A, B, C],$   
 $[A, B, C, E], [A, B, C, F], [A, B, C, G], [A, B, E, G], [A, B, F, G], [A, B, C, EF],$   
 $[A, B, C, E, G], [A, B, C, F, G], [A, B, E, F, G], [A, B, C, E, F, G].$