

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON  
IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND MEDICINE

EXAMINATIONS 2002

BEng Honours Degree in Computing Part I  
MEng Honours Degrees in Computing Part I  
for Internal Students of the Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine

*This paper is also taken for the relevant examinations for the  
Associateship of the City and Guilds of London Institute*

PAPER C130

DATABASES 1

Wednesday 8 May 2002, 14:00

Duration: 90 minutes  
(Reading time 5 minutes)

*Answer THREE questions*

---

Paper contains 4 questions  
Calculators not required

**Section A** (Use a separate answer book for this Section)

1a Consider relation schema  $R(A, W, X, Y)$ ,  $S(B, W, X, Z)$ .

- i) What is the schema (i.e., the attributes) of  $R \text{ join } S$  ?  
Express  $R \text{ join } S$  using only the operators product, select, project.
- ii) What is the schema of  $R \div S[W, X]$  ?  
What does this expression represent (in words)?

b Consider the following relation schema.

TimeData( EmpId, ProjId, Hours )

Project( ProjId, Manager, Location, Budget )

Attribute Manager in relation Project has the same domain as attribute EmpId in relation TimeData. ProjId in TimeData is a foreign key referring to ProjId in Project.

A tuple  $(e, p, h)$  in TimeData indicates that employee with identifier  $e$  has worked for  $h$  hours on project  $p$ . A tuple  $(p, m, l, b)$  in Project indicates that project  $p$  has a manager  $m$ , is located at location  $l$ , and has a total budget  $b$ .

Formulate the following queries in relational algebra.

- i) For every project, find the number of hours worked by the manager on that project. Your query should return triples (manager, project, hours).
  - ii) Find the employees who work on every project located in York.
  - iii) Find the managers of the projects with the largest budgets.  
You can assume that budget values can be compared using the comparison operator  $>$ .  
Your query should return tuples (manager, project).  
For this query only, give a *brief* explanation of how your algebra expression produces the desired answer.
- c On the basis of the relation schema of part b formulate queries b(i) and b(ii) in *tuple relational calculus*.

---

*The three parts carry, respectively, 25%, 50%, 25% of the marks.*

2a Let  $R$  be the set of attributes of some relation  $R$  and let  $F$  be a set of functional dependencies on  $R$ .

- i) Let  $X \subseteq R$  be a set of attributes of relation  $R$ . Define  $X_F^+$ , the *closure* of attributes  $X$  under the functional dependencies  $F$ .
- ii) Let  $K \subseteq R$  be a set of attributes of relation  $R$ . Express in terms of the closure of  $K$  under  $F$  what it means to say that  $K$  is a *candidate key* of  $R$ .
- iii) Show using the definition of part ii) that  $AB$  and  $BC$  are both candidate keys of the relation  $R(A,B,C,D,E)$  with the following functional dependencies:

$$\begin{array}{ll} AB \rightarrow E & C \rightarrow A \\ AD \rightarrow C & E \rightarrow D \end{array}$$

- b i) Define Boyce-Codd normal form.
- ii) Show that the relation  $R$  in part a(iii) is not in Boyce-Codd normal form. You may assume without proof that there are no other candidate keys.
- iii) The following are two BCNF decompositions of the relation  $R$  in part a(iii).

$$R[\underline{C}, A] \text{ join } R[\underline{E}, D] \text{ join } R[\underline{B}, C, E]$$

$$R[\underline{A}, D, C] \text{ join } R[\underline{E}, D] \text{ join } R[\underline{A}, B, E]$$

Explain carefully why both of these decomposition are lossless (non-loss). There is no need to define the term lossless (non-loss). You may state any standard results without proof.

- c i) Define what is meant by a *dependency preserving* decomposition.
- ii) Are either of the decompositions in part b(iii) dependency preserving? You will need to determine the projections of the functional dependencies  $F$  on the decomposed relations, and hence determine which of the decompositions are dependency preserving.
- d i) Define what is meant by a multi-valued dependency  $A \twoheadrightarrow B$ .
- ii) Explain carefully why any relation that satisfies the functional dependency  $A \rightarrow B$  also satisfies the multi-valued dependency  $A \twoheadrightarrow B$ .
- iii) Are the relations in part b(iii) in Fourth Normal Form (4NF)? Justify your answer.

*The four parts carry, respectively, 25%, 25%, 25%, 25% of the marks.*

**Section B** (Use a separate answer book for this Section)

- 3a Explain what is meant by a *history* in the context of concurrency control.

Distinguish between a *serial* history and a *serialisable* history.

- b Transactions  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  (given below) have been defined for a banking environment. In each transaction the operations included involve subtracting an amount from one account (e.g.  $x$ ) and adding it to another account (e.g.  $y$ ) as well as reading/writing the current/updated balances of the relevant accounts.

$T_1 : r_1 [x] \ w_1 [x] \ r_1 [y] \ w_1 [y]$

$T_2 : r_2 [y] \ w_2 [y] \ r_2 [x] \ w_2 [x]$

The following history has been suggested for the concurrent running of these two transactions:

$H = r_1 [x] \ w_1 [x] \ r_2 [y] \ w_2 [y] \ r_1 [y] \ w_1 [y] \ r_2 [x] \ w_2 [x] \ c_1 \ c_2$

- i) By drawing the appropriate serialisation graph, show that this history is non-serialisable.
  - ii) Discuss why this history may nevertheless be considered to be *correct* (i.e produces consistent results).
  - iii) Give an alternative history that is non-serialisable and incorrect.
- c Explain what is meant by the *two phase locking* (2PL) protocol.

Distinguish between *Basic* 2PL and *Strict* 2PL.

- d The execution of a history is said to be *strict* if both  $r_i [x]$  and  $w_i [x]$  operations are delayed until all transactions  $T_j$  ( $j \neq i$ ) that had previously written  $x$  have either committed or aborted.

Let history  $H$  represent an execution in which

$w_i [x] < o_j [x]$  (i.e. write precedes operation  $o$ )

where  $o_j [x]$  is either  $r_j [x]$  or  $w_j [x]$ .

---

Show that if this history is produced by a Strict 2PL scheduler, then the ensuing execution will be strict.

*The four parts carry, respectively, 15%, 35%, 20%, 30% of the marks.*

- 4a Explain what is meant by a *victim* in the context of deadlock recovery.

It is generally agreed that when choosing a victim one attempts to find the *least cost* solution. Explain what is meant by this and discuss how an appropriate victim that meets this criterion is chosen.

- b Discuss what is meant by *livelock*.

Compare and contrast the *Wound-Wait* and *Wait-Die* approaches to deadlock prevention and show how livelock is prevented under these approaches.

- c Explain what is meant by *transaction atomicity*.

In a distributed environment, in which several remote sites are connected by a network, it is possible for the execution of a transaction to be so arranged that different parts of the transaction are executed at separate sites.

Discuss the problem of ensuring overall transaction atomicity in such an environment and suggest a method whereby atomicity can be guaranteed.

*The three parts carry, respectively, 30%, 35% and 35% of the marks.*