

Functional Dependencies:

Let:

ID = A, City = B, Species = C, Appearance = D, Name = E, Speed = F, Type = G,  
Market\_Price = H, Riding\_Proficiency = I

$r_{Mounts}(ABCDEFGHI) = F(A \rightarrow BCDEFGHI, F \rightarrow GI, I \rightarrow GF, BCE \rightarrow ADFGHI)$

Below you will find the normalization process for one of our more complicated relations.

3NF:

relation Mounts

$r(ABCDEFGHI)$

FD's ( $A \rightarrow BCDEFGHI, F \rightarrow GI, I \rightarrow GF, BCE \rightarrow ADFGHI$ )

Candidate keys: A & BCE

Test  $A \rightarrow BCDEFGHI$

Trivial, fails

super key, passes

Test  $F \rightarrow GI$

Trivial, fails

super key, fails

contained in candidate key, fails

Canonical Cover:

$A \rightarrow BCDEFGHI$

Is B extraneous?

No

Is C extraneous?

No

Is D extraneous?

Yes, remove D

Is E extraneous?

Yes, remove E

Is F extraneous?

Yes, remove F

Is G extraneous?

Yes, remove G

Is H extraneous?

Yes, remove H

Is I extraneous?

Yes, remove I

$F_c(A \rightarrow BCE, F \rightarrow GI, I \rightarrow GF, BCE \rightarrow ADFGHI)$

$F \rightarrow GI$

Is G extraneous?

No

Is I extraneous?

No

$I \rightarrow GF$

Is G extraneous?

No

Is F extraneous?

No

$BCE \rightarrow ADFGHI$

Is B extraneous?

Yes, remove

Is C extraneous?

Yes, remove

Is A extraneous?

No

Is D extraneous?

No

Is F extraneous?

No

Is G extraneous?

No

Is H extraneous?

No

Is I extraneous?

No

$F_c(A \rightarrow BCE, F \rightarrow GI, I \rightarrow GF, E \rightarrow ADFGHI)$

$r_1(ABCE), r_2(FGI), r_3(EADFGHI)$

We decided to denormalize our model, because this decomposition would have greatly increased our number of joins.

BCNF:

Let:

ID = A, City = B, Species = C, Appearance = D, Name = E, Speed = F, Type = G,  
Market\_Price = H, Riding\_Proficiency = I

$F = (A \rightarrow BCDEFGHI, F \rightarrow GI, I \rightarrow GF, BCE \rightarrow ADFGHI)$   
 $A \rightarrow BCDEFGHI$  passes trivially  
 $(F \rightarrow GI)^+ = FGI$ , so  $F \rightarrow GI$  does not pass  
 $r_1(FGI), \{F \rightarrow GI\}$  and  $r_x(ABCDE)$ ,  $F' = (A \rightarrow BCDE, BCE \rightarrow ADH)$   
 $A \rightarrow BCDE$  passes trivially  
 $(BCE)^+ = ABCDEH$ , thus it passes as well

Final change is  $r_1(FGI), \{F \rightarrow GI\}$  and  $r_2(ABCDE), \{A \rightarrow BCDE, BCE \rightarrow ADH\}$

In the end we decided that it would be best for our domain to keep our original model as it seemed it be the best in regards to performance.

### SQL Queries:

6)

Query to return all the characters in the realm "Aerie Peak" who are not in a guild and whose level is above 50.

```

SELECT name
FROM Characters
WHERE realm = 'Aerie Peak'
  EXISTS (
    SELECT name
    FROM Characters
    WHERE guild IS NULL
      AND name NOT IN (
        SELECT name
        FROM Characters
        WHERE level < 50));
  
```

7)

Lists the names and the levels of all characters who completed a quest below the required level.

```

SELECT name, level
FROM ((Characters AS c) JOIN Tracks ON name=character) JOIN (Quests AS q) ON id=quest
WHERE c.level < q.required_level
GROUP BY q.title
  
```

8)

List of all warrior talents that grant abilities

SELECT name

FROM (Classes JOIN Attains ON name=class) JOIN (Talents AS t) ON talent= t.name

WHERE x.name='Warrior' AND t.new\_spells IS NOT NULL

### **Relational Algebra:**

6)

Relational Algebra does not have ways of expressing NULL values

7)

title 5(  $\pi$  name, level( $\sigma$  level < required\_level ((Character X Tracks) X Quests)))

8)

Relational Algebra does not have ways of expressing NULL values

### **Indexing:**

Profiling Queries 7 and 8 without indexes...

QUERY 7 DURATION: 15 milliseconds

QUERY 8 DURATION: 0 milliseconds

Adding Indexes to model...

Profiling Queries 7 and 8 with indexes...

QUERY 7 DURATION: 31 milliseconds

QUERY 8 DURATION: 1 milliseconds

*As is shown above, we have a small enough amount of data in our model that, even when performing indexing with our more complicated queries, the added complexity actually decreased performance.*

### **NoSQL:**

Our project has a few drawbacks that would be fixed by implementing a NoSQL database instead.

Joins: The way our relational database is set up with the resulting logical model we require multiple joins in order to retrieve the information that we are looking for. Joins are costly, so the fewer of these that we can use the better it would be for our database.

Media: Certain relations for our domain have appearance keys which would be connected to certain models that would need to be loaded by the game.

Scalability: Since our domain represents that of a massive online multiplayer game, an obvious issue that our relational model would have would be scalability. In the real world the

database would need to store over a million different characters, which would means multiple millions of rows.