

CSC343 A3 Part2

Bilin Nong 1007643329

November 29, 2023

1 Part 2

1.1 (a)

BCNF requires that the LHS of an FD be a superkey.

$AC^+ = ABCDEFG$. Therefore $AC \rightarrow D$ does not violate BCNF.

$BG^+ = BEFG$ Since BG is not a super key so $BG \rightarrow E$ violates BCNF.

$D^+ = BCDEFG$ Since D is not a super key so $D \rightarrow CFG$ violates BCNF.

$DG^+ = BCDEFG$ So DG is not a super key therefore $DG \rightarrow B$ violates BCNF.

$G^+ = FG$ Since G is not a super key so $G \rightarrow F$ violates BCNF.

FDs violate BCNF: $\{BG \rightarrow E, D \rightarrow CFG, DG \rightarrow B, G \rightarrow F\}$

1.2 (b)

We start our decomposition from $D \rightarrow CFG$:

R1: AD

R2: $BCDEFG$

Shared Part: D

Project FDs onto R1 and R2:

Table R1: AD	
Closure	FD
$A^+ = A$	
$D^+ = D$	
$AD^+ = AD$	

Table R2: $BCDEFG$	
Closure	FD in R2
$B^+ = B$	$D \rightarrow BCDEFG$
$C^+ = C$	
$D^+ = BCDEFG$	
$E^+ = E$	
$F^+ = F$	
$G^+ = FG$	
	$G \rightarrow F$ (violates BCNF, stop the process)

Decompose R2 on $G \rightarrow F$:

R3: FG
R4: $BCDEG$
Shared Part: G

Table R3: FG	
Closure	FD
$F^+ = F$	
$G^+ = FG$	$G \rightarrow F$ (G is a superkey in R3)

Table R4: $BCDEG$	
Closure	FD
$B^+ = B$	
$C^+ = C$	
$D^+ = BCDEFG$	$D \rightarrow BCEG$
$E^+ = E$	
$G^+ = FG$	
$BG^+ = BEFG$	$BG \rightarrow E$ (BG not a superkey in R4, stop)

Decompose R4 on $BG \rightarrow E$:

R5: BEG
R6: $BCDG$
Shared Part: BG

Table R5: BEG	
Closure	FD
$B^+ = B$	
$E^+ = E$	
$G^+ = FG$	
$BE^+ = BE$	
$EG^+ = EFG$	
$BG^+ = BGEF$	$BG \rightarrow E$

Table R6: $BCDG$	
Closure	FD
$B^+ = B$	
$G^+ = FG$	
$C^+ = C$	
$D^+ = BCDEFG$	$D \rightarrow BCG$ (D is a superkey in R6, so every combination with D will satisfy BCNF)
$BC^+ = BC$	
$BG^+ = BEFG$	
$CG^+ = CFG$	
$BCG^+ = BCGEF$	

Therefore, the final decomposition is : AD with no FDs , $BCDG \{D \rightarrow BCG\}$, $BEG \{BG \rightarrow E\}$, $FG \{G \rightarrow F\}$,

1.3 (c)

No, it is not. The FDs in the final decomposition ensure that $BG \rightarrow E$ and $G \rightarrow F$ are preserved. However, at least one FD is not: $AC \rightarrow D$. Here is an counter example:

A	D	B	E	G	B	C	D	G
1	3	b_1	e_1	g_1	b_1	2	3	g_1
1	4	b	e	g	b	2	4	g

F	G
f_1	g_1
f	g

Rejoining these tables together, we violates the original FD $AC \rightarrow D$:

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	b_1	2	3	e_1	f_1	g_1
1	b	2	4	e	f	g

1.4 (d)

Set up $t = abcdefg$

Initial Tableau:

Initial Tableau						
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
a	b_1	c_1	d	e_1	f_1	g_1
a_2	b	c_2	d_2	e	f_2	g
a_3	b	c	d	e_3	f_3	g
a_4	b_4	c_4	d_4	e_4	f	g

According to FD $AC \rightarrow D$, nothing is changed, then proceed $BG \rightarrow E$:

$BG \rightarrow E$						
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
a	b_1	c_1	d	e_1	f_1	g_1
a_2	b	c_2	d_2	e	f_2	g
a_3	b	c	d	e	f_3	g
a_4	b_4	c_4	d_4	e_4	f	g

According to FD $D \rightarrow CFG$, we change the table to:

$D \rightarrow CFG$						
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
a	b_1	c	d	e_1	f_1	g
a_2	b	c_2	d_2	e	f_2	g
a_3	b	c	d	e	f_1	g
a_4	b_4	c_4	d_4	e_4	f	g

According to FD $DG \rightarrow B$, we change the table to:

$DG \rightarrow B$						
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
a	b	c	d	e_1	f_1	g
a_2	b	c_2	d_2	e	f_2	g
a_3	b	c	d	e	f_1	g
a_4	b_4	c_4	d_4	e_4	f	g

According to FD $G \rightarrow F$, we change the table to:

$G \rightarrow F$						
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
a	b	c	d	e_1	f	g
a_2	b	c_2	d_2	e	f	g
a_3	b	c	d	e	f	g
a_4	b_4	c_4	d_4	e_4	f	g

Since no completely unsubscribed row ($= t$) appears, proceed FDs again. According to $AC \rightarrow D$ nothing changed, then proceed $BG \rightarrow E$, we changed the table to:

$BG \rightarrow E$						
A	B	C	D	E	F	G
a	b	c	d	e	f	g
a_2	b	c_2	d_2	e	f	g
a_3	b	c	d	e	f	g
a_4	b_4	c_4	d_4	e_4	f	g

Notice that the first row is a completely unsubscribed row ($= t$), which proves that this is a lossless-join decomposition.

2 Question2

2.1 (a)

Step1: Split RHS

1. $N \rightarrow M$
2. $NO \rightarrow L$
3. $NO \rightarrow R$
4. $Q \rightarrow M$
5. $Q \rightarrow P$
6. $P \rightarrow R$
7. $Q \rightarrow N$
8. $Q \rightarrow O$

Step2: Try to reduce LHS

1. no simplification needed since there is only 1 attribute on the LHS.
2. Nothing is changed since $N^+ = NM$ and $O^+ = O$.
3. no simplification needed since there is only 1 attribute on the LHS.
4. Since $Q^+ = QNOLRMP$, we change this to $Q \rightarrow M$.
5. Since $Q^+ = QNOLRMP$, we change this to $Q \rightarrow P$.
6. no simplification needed since there is only 1 attribute on the LHS.
7. no simplification needed since there is only 1 attribute on the LHS.
8. no simplification needed since there is only 1 attribute on the LHS.

Step3: Eliminate Entire FDs

Table Step3			
FD	Exclude these from S1 when computing closure	Closure	Decision
1	1	$N^+ = N$	keep
2	2	$NO^+ = NOMR$	keep
3	3	$NO^+ = NOML$	keep
4	4	$Q^+ = QNOPLRM$	discard
5	4,5	$Q^+ = QNOMLR$	keep
6	4,6	$P^+ = P$	keep
7	4,7	$Q^+ = QOPR$	keep
8	4,8	$Q^+ = QMNPR$	keep

So we keep 1,2,3,5,6,7,8

The final answer is $\{N \rightarrow M, NO \rightarrow L, NO \rightarrow R, P \rightarrow R, Q \rightarrow O, Q \rightarrow P, Q \rightarrow N\}$

2.2 (b)

From the minimal basis in part (a), we summarized the occurrence of attributes as follow:

Attribute	Appears on		Conclusion
	LHS	RHS	
S	–	–	must be in every key
Q	✓	–	must be in every key
L, M, R	–	✓	is not in any key
N, O, P	✓	✓	must check

The keys for P is $\{ SQ \}$, since from the summary table, we know that SQ must in every key, before compute the closure of $P + SQ$ or $O + SQ$ or $N + SQ$, the closure of SQ gives $SQ^+ = SQOPNMLR$, therefore, SQ is already the key for this relation, no need to check any set of attributes contains SQ but greater than it.

2.3 (c)

Define four relations by 3NF:

R1: NM where NM is not a superkey since $NM^+ = NM$

R2: NOLR where NOLR is not a superkey since $NOLR^+ = NOLRM$

R3: NOPQ where NOPQ is not a superkey since $NOPQ^+ = NOPQLRM$

R4: PR where PR is not a superkey since $PR^+ = PR$

Since none of above 4 relations is superkey for B, we added one more relation that is a key as computed in the previous part:

R5: SQ

Therefore, we get our relations after 3NF synthesis: R1: NM, R2: NOLR, R3: NOPQ, R4: PR, R5: SQ.

2.4 (d)

There is no redundancy in this relation that satisfies 3NF, since R1, R4, R5 are 2-attribute table, satisfy BCNF; for R2, and R3, each FD is superkey when being projected on them, so no redundancy in R2 and R3.

Table <i>R2:NOLR</i>	
Closure	FDs in R2
$N^+ = NM$ $NO^+ = NOLR$ $L^+ = L$ $R^+ = R$ $LR^+ = LR$	$NO \rightarrow LR$ (NO is the superkey for this relation)

Table <i>R3:NOPQ</i>	
Closure	FDs in R3
$N^+ = NM$ $O^+ = O$ $P^+ = PR$ $Q^+ = QOPN$ $NO^+ = NOLR$ $NP^+ = NPMR$ $OP^+ = OPR$ $NOP^+ = NOPLRM$	$Q \rightarrow NOP$ (Q is the superkey for this relation)