# 352 Database Management Systems

# Project 2

## 1.Programming Task

In this part, I will talk about some assumptions and implementations that I did for functions I wrote. Since I believe there are some ambiguities in some of tasks. In the mp2.py file I wrote some comments about the functions: 'change\_stocks', 'ship', 'calc\_gross', 'change\_cart' and 'purschase cart'.

- In shipping function, there was no information about how much of the stock that the sellers ship out. So, I decided to remove only 1 stock per product from the seller stocks.
- In the calc gross, I didn't know how to calculate gross sum, so I just sum the prices.
- For the remaining functions, I thought that seller and customers should be able add new rows to seller\_stocks or customer\_carts with their functionalities.

So, when there is an add comment that obeys the rule of maximum and minimum. A new row will be added to the tables (customer\_carts or seller\_stocks depending on function). Also, while removing if calculation results in new value smaller than 0 then function will fail, but if they result in exactly 0 the row will be deleted from the tables (customer\_carts or seller\_stocks).

You can find my comments in the file.

#### 2.Written Task

### A)

I would use multiuser access mode because the functions are able work for different kind of users by implementation.

For sign up I would use repeatable read isolation level, because we don't want an uncommitted user info to be usable.

For show\_plans, show\_subscription, show\_quota, calc\_gross and show\_cart functions, I would use read uncommitted isolation level because these are printing functions that modifies nothing, so being fast is I think better.

For sign\_in, change\_stock, ship, change\_cart and purchase\_cart, I would use read committed because these functions all make changes in database and reading uncommitted data may result in incorrect results. Such as user taking 5 stocks from both of his\her sessions and end up with 10 products even though there wasn't that many product in the beginning.

This is the query I wrote to obtain the information wanted. And below is the output I received after the Explain command.

This is the time it took to execute.

Query plan before any indexes

```
## QUERY PLAN

Finalize GroupAggregate (cost=20231.14..31529.33 rows=112651 width=128)

Group Key: order_items.seller_id, products.product_category_name, orders.order_purchase_timestamp

-> Gather Merge (cost=20231.14..29176.92 rows=66265 width=64)

Workers Planned: 1

-> Partial GroupAggregate (cost=19231.13..20722.09 rows=66265 width=64)

Group Key: order_items.seller_id, products.product_category_name, orders.order_purchase_timestamp

-> Sort (cost=19231.13..19396.79 rows=66265 width=56)

Sort Key: order_items.seller_id, products.product_category_name, orders.order_purchase_timestamp

-> Parallel Hash Join (cost=4818.56..11656.64 rows=66265 width=56)

Hash Cond: ((order_items.order_id)::text = (orders.order_id)::text)

-> Hash Cond: ((order_items.product_id)::text = (products.product_id)::text)

-> Parallel Seq Scan on order_items (cost=0.00..2961.65 rows=66265 width=99)

-> Seq Scan on products (cost=0.00..767.51 rows=32951 width=48)

-> Parallel Hash (cost=2392.96..2392.96 rows=58496 width=41)

-> Parallel Seq Scan on orders (cost=0.00..2392.96 rows=58496 width=41)
```

From this query plan, we can see there is a lot of computational power going to grouping. Also, database uses hash for joining order\_id's and product\_id's. There are sequential scans on order items, products and orders.

I created the indexes below,

```
create index p1 on products using hash(product_id);
create index p2 on order_items using hash(product_id);
create index o1 on order_items using hash(order_id);
create index o2 on orders using hash(order_id);
```

The time it took is given below. I executed this and original query one after the other so system weight difference is I think is minimum and nothing changed for both plan and speed.

#### Then I created:

```
create index p1 on products (product_category_name);
create index p2 on order_items using hash(product_id);
create index o1 on order_items using hash(order_id);
create index o2 on orders (order_purchase_timestamp);
cluster products using p1;
cluster orders using o2;
```

### Before creting the indexes, I got:

With indexes:

So, I believe I can say, there is a bit of improvement in the execution speed with these. But I couldn't be too sure because the query plan I get is:

```
■ QUERY PLAN
Finalize GroupAggregate (cost=20231.14..31529.33 rows=112651 width=128)
  -> Gather Merge (cost=20231.14..29176.92 rows=66265 width=64)
       Workers Planned: 1
        -> Partial GroupAggregate (cost=19231.13..20722.09 rows=66265 width=64)
             Group Key: order_items.seller_id, products.product_category_name, orders.order_purchase_timestamp
             -> Sort (cost=19231.13..19396.79 rows=66265 width=56)
                   -> Parallel Hash Join (cost=4818.56..11656.64 rows=66265 width=56)
                         Hash Cond: ((order_items.order_id)::text = (orders.order_id)::text)
                         -> Hash Join (cost=1179.40..5052.19 rows=66265 width=81)
                               Hash Cond: ((order_items.product_id)::text = (products.product_id)::text)
                               -> Parallel Seq Scan on order_items (cost=0.00..2961.65 rows=66265 width=99)
                               -> Hash (cost=767.51..767.51 rows=32951 width=48)
                                     -> Seq Scan on products (cost=0.00..767.51 rows=32951 width=48)
                         -> Parallel Hash (cost=2392.96..2392.96 rows=58496 width=41)
                               -> Parallel Seq Scan on orders (cost=0.00..2392.96 rows=58496 width=41)
```

Which is the same with last one. So, the difference between speeds may be simply because of my computer speed.