

Database Management System (DBMS)

Lecture-34

Dharmendra Kumar

November 8, 2020

Boyce-codd normal form (BCNF)

A relation schema R is in BCNF with respect to a set F of functional dependencies if, for all functional dependencies in F^+ of the form $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$, where $\alpha \subseteq R$ and $\beta \subseteq R$, at least one of the following holds:

- $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ is a trivial functional dependency.
- α is a super key for R .

Relational Database Design

Example: The relation schema Student_Performance (name, courseNo, rollNo, grade) has the following FDs:

name, courseNo \rightarrow grade

rollNo, courseNo \rightarrow grade

name \rightarrow rollNo

rollNo \rightarrow name

Is this relation in BCNF?

Solution:

Consider FD, name, courseNo \rightarrow grade. Clearly, {name, courseNo} is a super key, therefore this satisfy 2nd criteria of BCNF.

Consider FD, rollNo, courseNo \rightarrow grade. Clearly, {rollNo, courseNo} is a super key, therefore this satisfy 2nd criteria of BCNF.

Consider FD, name \rightarrow rollNo. Clearly, this functional dependency not satisfy any condition of BCNF. Therefore, this is not in BCNF.

Relational Database Design

Example: Consider the following relation schemas and their respective functional dependencies:

Customer = (customer-name, customer-street, customer-city)

customer-name \rightarrow customer-street, customer-city

Branch = (branch-name, assets, branch-city)

branch-name \rightarrow assets, branch-city

Loan = (branch-name, customer-name, loan-number, amount)

loan-number \rightarrow amount, branch-name

Clearly, Customer and Branch schema are in BCNF, because left side of functional dependency **customer-name** \rightarrow **customer-street, customer-city** and **branch-name** \rightarrow **assets, branch-city** is super key.

But Loan schema is not in BCNF, because left side of functional dependency **loan-number** \rightarrow **amount, branch-name** is not super key and this functional dependency is also not trivial.

Decomposition into 2NF

Example:

Let $R = \{ A, B, C, D \}$ and $F = \{ AB \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow D \}$.

Is this relation schema in 2NF? If not then decompose it into 2NF.

Solution:

Here, Primary key = $\{A, B\}$.

Clearly, this is not in 2NF because partial dependency holds.

Now, we decompose R into R_1 and R_2 as the following:-

$R_1 = (A, B, C), F_1 = \{AB \rightarrow C\}$

$R_2 = (B, D), F_2 = \{B \rightarrow D\}$

Now, R_1 and R_2 are in 2NF.

Decomposition into Normal form

Example:

Student-course-info(Name, Course, Grade, Phone-no, Major, Course-dept)

$F = \{ \text{Name} \rightarrow \text{Phone-no Major}, \text{Course} \rightarrow \text{Course-dept}, \text{Name Course} \rightarrow \text{Grade} \}$

Is this relation schema in 2NF? If not then decompose it into 2NF.

Solution:

Here, Primary key = {Name, Course}.

Clearly, this is not in 2NF because partial dependency holds.

Now, we decompose R into R_1 , R_2 and R_3 as the following:-

$R_1 = (\text{Name}, \text{Phone-no}, \text{Major}), F_1 = \{ \text{Name} \rightarrow \text{Phone-no Major} \}$

$R_2 = (\text{Course}, \text{Course-dept}), F_2 = \{ \text{Course} \rightarrow \text{Course-dept} \}$

$R_3 = (\text{Name}, \text{Course}, \text{Grade}), F_3 = \{ \text{Name Course} \rightarrow \text{Grade} \}$

Now, R_1 , R_2 and R_3 are in 3NF.

Decomposition into 3NF

Example:

Let $R = \{ A, B, C, D \}$ and $F = \{ A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow D \}$.

Is this relation schema in 3NF? If not then decompose it into 3NF.

Solution:

Here, Primary key = $\{A\}$.

Clearly, this is not in 3NF because transitivity dependency holds.

Now, we decompose R into R_1 and R_2 as the following:-

$R_1 = (A, B, C), F_1 = \{A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C\}$

$R_2 = (B, D), F_2 = \{B \rightarrow D\}$

Now, R_1 and R_2 are in 3NF.

Decomposition into Normal form

Example:

Let Banker-info = { branch-name, customer-name, banker-name, office-number} and $F = \{ \text{banker-name} \rightarrow \text{branch-name office-number}, \text{customer-name branch-name} \rightarrow \text{banker-name} \}$.

Is this relation schema in 3NF? If not then decompose it into 3NF.

Solution:

Here, Primary key = {customer-name, branch-name}.

Clearly, this is not in 3NF because transitivity dependency holds.

Now, we decompose relation Banker-info into R_1 and R_2 as the following:-

$R_1 = (\text{banker-name}, \text{branch-name}, \text{office-number})$, $F_1 = \{ \text{banker-name} \rightarrow \text{branch-name office-number} \}$

$R_2 = (\text{customer-name}, \text{branch-name}, \text{banker-name})$, $F_2 = \{ \text{customer-name branch-name} \rightarrow \text{banker-name} \}$

Now, R_1 and R_2 are in 3NF.

Decomposition into Normal form

Decomposition into BCNF

If R is not in BCNF, then we can decompose R into a collection of BCNF schemas R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n by the algorithm. The decomposition that the algorithm generates is not only in BCNF, but is also a lossless-join decomposition.

Input: R and F

Output: result

$result \leftarrow R$

$done \leftarrow false$

compute F^+

while ($done = false$) **do**

if (*there is a schema R_i in result that is not in BCNF*) **then**

 let $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ be a nontrivial functional dependency that holds on R_i

 such that $\alpha \rightarrow R_i$ is not in F^+ , and $\alpha \cap \beta = \phi$

$result \leftarrow (result - R_i) \cup (R_i - \beta) \cup (\alpha, \beta)$

end

else

$done = true$

end

end

Decomposition into Normal form

Example:

Consider the following schema:-

Lending-schema = (branch-name, branch-city, assets, customer-name, loan-number, amount)

$F = \{ \text{branch-name} \rightarrow \text{assets} \text{ branch-city}, \text{loan-number} \rightarrow \text{amount} \text{ branch-name} \}$

Is this relation schema in BCNF? If not then decompose it into BCNF.

Decomposition into Normal form

Solution:

Here, Primary key = {customer-name, loan-number}.

Clearly, this is not in BCNF.

Now, we decompose relation Lending-schema into R_1 and R_2 as the following:-

$R_1 = (\text{customer-name, loan-number, amount, branch-name})$

$F_1 = \{ \text{loan-number} \rightarrow \text{amount branch-name} \}$

$R_2 = (\text{branch-name, assets, branch-city})$

$F_2 = \{ \text{branch-name} \rightarrow \text{assets branch-city} \}$

Clearly, R_1 is not in BCNF. Therefore, we again decompose R_1 .

Now, we decompose relation R_1 into R_3 and R_4 as the following:-

$R_3 = (\text{customer-name, loan-number})$

$F_3 = \phi$

$R_4 = (\text{loan-number, amount, branch-name})$

$F_4 = \{ \text{loan-number} \rightarrow \text{amount branch-name} \}$

Now, the final relation schema are R_2 , R_3 and R_4 . All these are in BCNF.