

Introduction to Database Systems

Normalization

Lee Mong Li

Recap: Functional Dependencies

Definition: $X \rightarrow Y$

- If two tuples agree on the values of the attributes in X , then they agree on the values of the attributes in Y .
- **Example:** $\{\text{position}\} \rightarrow \{\text{salary}\}$

If two employees have the same position, they also have the same salary.

Types of FDs:

- Trivial $Y \subset X$
- Non-trivial $Y \not\subset X$
- Completely non-trivial $Y \cap X = \emptyset$
- **Example:** Given a relation $R(A,B,C,D,E)$ with
 $F = \{AB \rightarrow CE, CD \rightarrow D, ACE \rightarrow BC, D \rightarrow E\}$

How many FDs of each type are there?

Armstrong's Axioms

Let X, Y, Z be subsets of the scheme of relation R

- **Reflexivity:** If $Y \subset X$, then $X \rightarrow Y$
- **Augmentation:** If $X \rightarrow Y$, then $X \cup Z \rightarrow Y \cup Z$
- **Transitivity:** If $X \rightarrow Y$ and $Y \rightarrow Z$, then $X \rightarrow Z$

Example: Given a relation $R(A,B,C,D,E)$ with
 $F = \{ AB \rightarrow ABCE, C \rightarrow BC \}$

Show that ACD is a **superkey** using the axioms.

In other words, show that $ACD \rightarrow ABCDE$

Attribute Closure

For a set X of attributes, we call the **closure of X (w.r.t. a set of FDs)**, denoted by X_+ , the maximum set of attributes such that $X \rightarrow X_+$.

Example: Given a relation $R(A, B, C, D, E)$ with

$$F = \{A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow D\}$$

Is A in A_+ ? Is B in A_+ ? Is C in A_+ ? Is D in A_+ ? Is E in A_+ ?

Algorithm:

- Start with the given set X .
- Find and add new attributes which can be determined by any subset of X , until no more attributes can be added.

*Useful for (a) finding **candidate keys** and (b) proving **equivalence of sets of FDs***

Candidate Keys

Consider the relation $R(A,B,C,D,E)$ with the FDs:

$AB \rightarrow CDE$

$AC \rightarrow BDE$

$B \rightarrow C$

$C \rightarrow B$

$C \rightarrow D$

$B \rightarrow E$

Find all candidate keys

Equivalence of 2 Sets of FDs

Algorithm based on attribute closure

Intuition:

- Given two sets of FDs F and G
- If we have in F , $A \rightarrow B$ and $A^+ = ABC$, then we know that $A \rightarrow A$, $A \rightarrow B$ and $A \rightarrow C$ is in F^+
- And if we have in G , $A^+ = AB$, then we know that there is some FD (i.e., $A \rightarrow C$) in F^+ but not in G^+
- Hence, F and G are not equivalent.

Minimal Cover

A set of FDs F is a minimal cover for a set of FDs G if and only if

- Every FD in F is of the form $X \rightarrow A$ where X is a set of attributes, A is a **single attribute** and X has **no redundant attributes**
- There are **no redundant FDs** in F
- F is equivalent to G , that is, **$F^+ = G^+$**

Minimal Cover

Consider the relation $R(A,B,C,D,E)$ with FDs:

$AB \rightarrow CDE$

$AC \rightarrow BDE$

$B \rightarrow C$

$C \rightarrow B$

$C \rightarrow D$

$B \rightarrow E$

Find a **minimal cover** for the FDs

Normalization

Process of Decomposition

- Break down a relation into smaller relations such that all attributes are still present in at least one of the smaller relations.

Lossless / Lossy

- Whether the original relation can be recovered by combining the smaller relations.

Dependency preserving

- Whether all the dependencies still exist in the smaller relations.

Decomposition

Given a relation $R(A,B,C)$ with $\{A\} \rightarrow \{B,C\}$, which of the following are decompositions?

$R1(A), R2(B)$	No
$R1(A,C), R2(B)$	Yes
$R1(A,B), R2(B,C)$	Yes
$R1(A,B), R2(A,C)$	Yes
$R1(A,C), R2(B,C)$	Yes

Decomposition

Given a relation $R(A,B,C)$ with $\{A\} \rightarrow \{B,C\}$, which are **lossless** decompositions?

$R1(A), R2(B)$ No

$R1(A,C), R2(B)$ No

$R1(A,B), R2(B,C)$ No

$R1(A,B), R2(A,C)$

$R1(A,C), R2(B,C)$

A	B	C
1	Bill	Gates
2	Bill	Clinton

A	B
1	Bill
2	Bill

B	C
Bill	Gates
Bill	Clinton

A	B	C
1	Bill	Gates
1	Bill	Clinton
2	Bill	Gates
2	Bill	Clinton

Decomposition

Given a relation $R(A,B,C)$ with $\{A\} \rightarrow \{B,C\}$, which are **lossless** decompositions?

$R1(A), R2(B)$ No

$R1(A,C), R2(B)$ No

$R1(A,B), R2(B,C)$ No

$R1(A,B), R2(A,C)$ Yes

$R1(A,C), R2(B,C)$

A	B	C
1	Bill	Gates
2	Bill	Clinton

A	B
1	Bill
2	Bill

A	C
1	Gates
2	Clinton

A	B	C
1	Bill	Gates
2	Bill	Clinton

Decomposition

Given a relation $R(A,B,C)$ with $\{A\} \rightarrow \{B,C\}$, which are **lossless** decompositions?

$R1(A), R2(B)$ No

$R1(A,C), R2(B)$ No

$R1(A,B), R2(B,C)$ No

$R1(A,B), R2(A,C)$ Yes

$R1(A,C), R2(B,C)$ No

A	B	C
1	Steve	Jobs
2	New	Jobs

A	C
1	Jobs
2	Jobs

B	C
Steve	Jobs
New	Jobs

A	B	C
1	Steve	Jobs
1	New	Jobs
2	Steve	Jobs
2	New	Jobs

Decomposition

Given a relation $R(A,B,C)$ with $\{A\} \rightarrow \{B,C\}$, which are
dependency preserving decompositions?

$R1(A), R2(B)$ No

$R1(A,C), R2(B)$ No

$R1(A,B), R2(B,C)$ No

$R1(A,B), R2(A,C)$ Yes

$R1(A,C), R2(B,C)$ No

$R1(A,B)$ $A \rightarrow B$

$R1(A,C)$ $A \rightarrow C$

Normal Forms

Boyce-Codd Normal Form (BCNF)

- For any FD $X \rightarrow Y$ on a relation R , either the FD is trivial (i.e., $Y \subset X$) or X is a superkey of R

Third Normal Form (3NF)

- For any FD $X \rightarrow Y$ on a relation R , either the FD is trivial (i.e., $Y \subset X$), or X is a superkey, or Y is part of some candidate key

Example:

- Given a relation $R(A, B, C, D, E, G)$ with FDs
$$F = \{ AB \rightarrow CDEG, \quad E \rightarrow G \}$$
- Candidate key: AB
- $E \rightarrow G$ violates both BCNF and 3NF

Decomposition into BCNF

Given a set of relations and a set of FDs

1. Find FD $X \rightarrow Y$ on a relation R that violates BCNF property
2. Decompose R into $(R - X^+ + X)$ and X^+ (and project the FDs)
3. Repeat Steps 1 & 2 until all relations are in BCNF

Note: It is sometimes useful to find the minimal cover first.

Example: $R(A, B, C, D, E, G)$ with $F = \{ AB \rightarrow CDEG, E \rightarrow G \}$

- $E \rightarrow G$ violates BCNF
- BCNF decomposition into:
 - $R_1(E, G)$ with $F_1 = \{ E \rightarrow G \}$
 - $R_2(A, B, C, D, E)$ with $F_2 = \{ AB \rightarrow CDE \}$

Decomposition into 3NF

Given a set of relations and a set of FDs

1. Find the minimal cover G .
2. For every FD $X \rightarrow Y$ in G ,
If $X \cup Y$ is not in the existing relations, then add a relation R with $X \cup Y$ (and project the FDs)
3. If there is no relation containing the key, add a relation with the key.

Note 1: The given relations are ignored.

Note 2: The extended minimal cover can be used, too.

Example: $R(A, B, C, D, E, G)$ with $F = \{ AB \rightarrow CDEG, E \rightarrow G \}$

- $E \rightarrow G$ violates 3NF
- $G = \{ AB \rightarrow C, AB \rightarrow D, AB \rightarrow E, E \rightarrow G \}$
- Extended minimal cover $G' = \{ AB \rightarrow CDE, E \rightarrow G \}$
- 3NF synthesis: $\{ R1(\underline{A}, \underline{B}, C, D, E), R2(\underline{E}, G) \}$

BCNF Decomposition

Consider the relation $R(A,B,C,D,E)$ with FDs:

$AB \rightarrow CDE$

$AC \rightarrow BDE$

$B \rightarrow C$

$C \rightarrow B$

$C \rightarrow D$

$B \rightarrow E$

Give a BCNF decomposition of R .

3NF Decomposition

Consider the relation $R(A,B,C,D,E)$ with FDs:

$AB \rightarrow CDE$

$AC \rightarrow BDE$

$B \rightarrow C$

$C \rightarrow B$

$C \rightarrow D$

$B \rightarrow E$

Give a 3NF decomposition of R .