NORMALIZATION – BCNF

CIS-673, LECTURE#16

BY RAJ PATIL

2 BCNF

- BCNF (3.5 NF)
 - Should be in 3NF
 - For all the dependencies, the LHS should be a super (candidate) key

| | SUBSET OF CK → NPA (PD) | NPA → NPA (TD) | NPA → PA, PA → PA | CK → PA OR CK → NPA |
|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 2NF | NO | YES | YES | YES |
| 3NF | NO | NO | YES | YES |
| BCNF (3.5NF) | NO | NO | NO | YES |

3 BCNF EXAMPLE

- BCNF
 - Should be in 3NF
 - For all FDs, LHS should be a super key (SK)

• R(A, B, C), $FD = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C, C \rightarrow A\}$

CK = {A, B, C}, PA = {A, B, C}, NPA = {}

| Depend encies | PD? | TD? | BCNF Violation? |
|-------------------|-----|-----|--------------------|
| $A \rightarrow B$ | No | No | No |
| $B \rightarrow C$ | No | No | No |
| $C \rightarrow A$ | No | No | No |

• R is in BCNF

4 BCNF EXAMPLE#2

- R(J, K, L)
- $F = \{ JK \rightarrow L, L \rightarrow K \}$
- CK = { (JK), (JL) }, PA = { J, K, L} , NPA = { }

| Depend encies | PD? | TD? | BCNF Violation? |
|--------------------|-----|-----|--------------------|
| $JK \rightarrow L$ | No | No | No |
| $L \rightarrow K$ | No | No | YES |

• R is in 3NF, but not in BCNF

Redundancy in 3NF

- Consider the schema R below, which is in 3NF
 - R = (J, K, L)
 - $F = \{JK \rightarrow L, L \rightarrow K\}$
 - And an instance table:

| J | L | Κ |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| j_1 | <i>I</i> ₁ | <i>k</i> ₁ |
| j_2 | <i>I</i> ₁ | <i>k</i> ₁ |
| j ₃ | <i>I</i> ₁ | <i>k</i> ₁ |
| null | <i>I</i> ₂ | k ₂ |

- What is wrong with the table?
 - Repetition of information
 - Need to use null values (e.g., to represent the relationship l_2 , k_2 where there is no corresponding value for J)

5 DECOMPOSITION

- Eliminate redundancy by splitting the table, and creating a separate table for the dependency violating BCNF.
- Decompose R(J,K,L) into R1, R2.
- Dependency that violated BCNF: L → K
- R2(L, K)
- RI(J,L)

6 AFTER DECOMPOSITION

| I | L |
|----------------|----------------|
| j ₁ | I _I |
| j ₂ | I ₁ |
| j ₃ | I _I |

• RI(J, L)

•

| Ī | К |
|----------------|----------------|
| I _I | k _I |
| l ₂ | k_2 |

• RI is in BCNF

Is the decomposition lossless?

• R2(L, K)

•
$$FD = \{L \rightarrow K\}$$

•
$$PA = \{L\}, NPA = \{K\}$$

| Dependencies | BCNF violation? | |
|-------------------|-----------------|--|
| $L \rightarrow K$ | No | |

• R2 is in BCNF

7 BCNF EXAMPLE#3

- dept_advisor(s_ID, i_ID, dept_name)
- FD = $\{i_ID \rightarrow dept_name, (s_ID, dept_name) \rightarrow i_ID\}$
- CK = { (s_ID, i_ID), (s_ID, dept_name) }
- PA = {s_ID, i_ID, dept_name}, NPA = {}

| Dependencies | PD? | TD? | BCNF Violation? |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----------------|
| i_ID → dept_name | No | No | Yes |
| $(s_ID, dept_name) \rightarrow i_ID$ | No | No | No |

Dept_advisor is in 3NF, but not in BCNF

8 AFTER DECOMPOSITION

- Eliminate redundancy by splitting the table, and creating a separate table for the dependency violating BCNF.
- Decompose dept_advisor(s_ID, i_ID, dept_name)
- Dependency that violated BCNF: i_ID → dept_name
- R2(i_ID, dept_name)
- RI(s_ID, i_ID)