Schema Refinement and Normal Forms

Chapter 19

Instructor: Vladimir Zadorozhny

vladimir@sis.pitt.edu

Information Science Program

School of Information Sciences,

University of Pittsburgh

The Evils of Redundancy

- *Redundancy* is at the root of several problems associated with relational schemas:
  - ***redundant storage, insert/delete/update anomalies***
- Integrity constraints, in particular *functional dependencies*, can be used to identify schemas with such problems and to suggest refinements.
- Main refinement technique: *decomposition* (replacing ABCD with, say, AB and BCD, or ACD and ABD).
- Decomposition should be used judiciously:
  - Is there reason to decompose a relation?
  - What problems (if any) does the decomposition cause?

Example

- Consider the relation schema:
  Lending-schema = (*branch-name, branch-city, assets, customer-name, loan-number, amount)*

branch-name	*branch-city*	*assets*	*customer-name*	*loan-number*	*amount*
Downtown	Brooklyn	9000000	Jones	L-17	1000
Redwood	Palo Alto	2100000	Smith	L-23	2000
Perryridge	Horseneck	1700000	Hayes	L-15	1500
Downtown	Brooklyn	9000000	Jackson	L-14	1500

- Redundancy:
  - Data for *branch-name, branch-city,* assets are repeated for each loan that a branch makes
  - Wastes space
  - Complicates updating, introducing possibility of inconsistency of *assets* value
- Null values
  - Cannot store information about a branch if no loans exist
  - Can use null values, but they are difficult to handle.

3

Decomposition of a Relation Scheme

- Suppose that relation R contains attributes *A1 ... An.* A *decomposition* of R consists of replacing R by two or more relations such that:
  - Each new relation scheme contains a subset of the attributes of R (and no attributes that do not appear in R), and
  - Every attribute of R appears as an attribute of one of the new relations.
- Intuitively, decomposing R means we will store instances of the relation schemes produced by the decomposition, instead of instances of R.
- E.g., Can decompose SNLRWH into SNLRH and RW.

Lossless Join Decompositions

- Decomposition of R into X and Y is *lossless-join* w.r.t. a set of FDs F if, for every instance *r* that satisfies F:
  - $\pi_X(r) \bowtie \pi_Y(r) = r$
- It is always true that $r \subseteq \pi_X(r) \bowtie \pi_Y(r)$
  - In general, the other direction does not hold! If it does, the decomposition is lossless-join.
- Definition extended to decomposition into 3 or more relations in a straightforward way.
- *It is essential that all decompositions used to deal with redundancy be lossless!*

Functional Dependencies (FDs)

- A functional dependency $X \rightarrow Y$ holds over relation R if, for every allowable instance *r* of R:
  - $t1 \in r$, $t2 \in r$, $\pi_X(t1) = \pi_X(t2)$ implies $\pi_Y(t1) = \pi_Y(t2)$
  - i.e., given two tuples in *r*, if the X values agree, then the Y values must also agree. (X and Y are *sets* of attributes.)
- An FD is a statement about *all* allowable relations.
  - Must be identified based on semantics of application.
  - Given some allowable instance *r1* of R, we can check if it violates some FD *f*, but we cannot tell if *f* holds over R!
- K is a candidate key for R means that $K \rightarrow R$
  - However, $K \rightarrow R$ does not require K to be *minimal*!

Example

- Consider relation Hourly_Emps:
  - Hourly_Emps (*ssn*, *name, lot, rating, hrly_wages, hrs_worked*)
- *Notation*: We will denote this relation schema by listing the attributes: SNLRWH
  - This is really the *set* of attributes {S,N,L,R,W,H}.
  - Sometimes, we will refer to all attributes of a relation by using the relation name. (e.g., Hourly_Emps for SNLRWH)
- Some FDs on Hourly_Emps:
  - *ssn* is the key: S → SNLRWH
  - *rating* determines *hrly_wages*: R → W

Example (Contd.)

S	N	L	R	W	H
123-22-3666	Attishoo	48	8	10	40
231-31-5368	Smiley	22	8	10	30
131-24-3650	Smethurst	35	5	7	30
434-26-3751	Guldu	35	5	7	32
612-67-4134	Madayan	35	8	10	40

- Problems due to R→W :
  - *Update anomaly*: Can we change W in just the 1st tuple of SNLRWH?
  - *Insertion anomaly*: What if we want to insert an employee and don't know the hourly wage for his rating?
  - *Deletion anomaly*: If we delete all employees with rating 5, we lose the information about the wage for rating 5!

S	N	L	R	H
123-22-3666	Attishoo	48	8	40
231-31-5368	Smiley	22	8	30
131-24-3650	Smethurst	35	5	30
434-26-3751	Guldu	35	5	32
612-67-4134	Madayan	35	8	40

Hourly_Emps2

R	W
8	10
5	7

Wages

Reasoning About FDs

- Given some FDs, we can usually infer additional FDs:
  - *ssn* $\rightarrow$ *did*, *did* $\rightarrow$ *lot* implies *ssn* $\rightarrow$ *lot*
- An FD *f* is *implied by* a set of FDs *F* if *f* holds whenever all FDs in *F* hold.
  - F^+ = *closure of F* is the set of all FDs that are implied by *F*.
- Armstrong's Axioms (X, Y, Z are sets of attributes):
  - *Reflexivity*: If $Y \subseteq X$, then $X \rightarrow Y$
  - *Augmentation*: If $X \rightarrow Y$, then $XZ \rightarrow YZ$ for any Z
  - *Transitivity*: If $X \rightarrow Y$ and $Y \rightarrow Z$, then $X \rightarrow Z$
- These are *sound* and *complete* inference rules for FDs!

Reasoning About FDs (Contd.)

- Couple of additional rules (that follow from AA):
  - *Union*: If $X \rightarrow Y$ and $X \rightarrow Z$, then $X \rightarrow YZ$
  - *Decomposition*: If $X \rightarrow YZ$, then $X \rightarrow Y$ and $X \rightarrow Z$
- Example: Contracts(*cid,sid,jid,did,pid,qty,value*), and:
  - C is the key: $C \rightarrow CSJDPQV$
  - Project purchases each part using single contract: $JP \rightarrow C$
  - Dept purchases at most one part from a supplier: $SD \rightarrow P$
- $JP \rightarrow C$, $C \rightarrow CSJDPQV$ imply $JP \rightarrow CSJDPQV$
- $SD \rightarrow P$ implies $SDJ \rightarrow JP$
- $SDJ \rightarrow JP$, $JP \rightarrow CSJDPQV$ imply $SDJ \rightarrow CSJDPQV$

Reasoning About FDs (Contd.)

- Computing the closure of a set of FDs can be expensive. (Size of closure is exponential in # attrs!)
- Typically, we just want to check if a given FD $X \rightarrow Y$ is in the closure of a set of FDs F. An efficient check:
  - Compute *attribute closure* of X (denoted X^+) wrt F:
    - Set of all attributes A such that X $\rightarrow$ A is in F^+
    - There is a linear time algorithm to compute this.
  - Check if Y is in X^+
- Does F = {A $\rightarrow$ B, B $\rightarrow$ C, C D $\rightarrow$ E } imply A $\rightarrow$ E?
  - i.e, is A $\rightarrow$ E in the closure F^+? Equivalently, is E in A^+ ?

More on Lossless Join

- The decomposition of R into X and Y is lossless-join wrt F if and only if the closure of F contains:
  - X $\cap$ Y $\rightarrow$ X, or
  - X $\cap$ Y $\rightarrow$ Y
- In particular, the decomposition of R into UV and R - V is lossless-join if U $\rightarrow$ V holds over R.

A	B	C
1	2	3
4	5	6
7	2	8

A	B
1	2
4	5
7	2

B	C
2	3
5	6
2	8

A	B	C
1	2	3
4	5	6
7	2	8
1	2	8
7	2	3

Normalization Using Functional Dependencies

- When we decompose a relation schema R with a set of functional dependencies F into R_1, R_2,.., R_n we want
  - ***Lossless-join decomposition***: Otherwise decomposition would result in information loss.
  - ***No redundancy:*** The relations R_i preferably should be in either Boyce-Codd Normal Form or Third Normal Form.
  - ***Dependency preservation:*** We will talk about it a little later.

Normal Forms

- Returning to the issue of schema refinement, the first question to ask is whether any refinement is needed!
- If a relation is in a certain *normal form* (BCNF, 3NF etc.), it is known that certain kinds of problems are avoided/minimized. This can be used to help us decide whether decomposing the relation will help.
- Role of FDs in detecting redundancy:
  - Consider a relation R with 3 attributes, ABC.
    - No FDs hold: There is no redundancy here.
    - Given $A \rightarrow B$: Several tuples could have the same A value, and if so, they'll all have the same B value!

Boyce-Codd Normal Form (BCNF)

- Reln R with FDs *F* is in BCNF if, for all X $\rightarrow$ A in F^+
  - A $\in$ X (called a *trivial* FD), or
  - X contains a key for R.
- In other words, R is in BCNF if the only non-trivial FDs that hold over R are key constraints.
  - No redundancy in R that can be detected using FDs alone.
  - If we are shown two tuples that agree upon the X value, we cannot infer the A value in one tuple from the A value in the other.
  - If example relation is in BCNF, the 2 tuples must be identical (since X is a key).

X	Y	A
x	y1	a
x	y2	?

Decomposition into BCNF

- Consider relation R with FDs F. If X $\rightarrow$ Y violates BCNF, decompose R into R - Y and XY.
  - Repeated application of this idea will give us a collection of relations that are in BCNF; lossless join decomposition, and guaranteed to terminate.
  - e.g., CSJDPQV, key C, JP $\rightarrow$ C, SD $\rightarrow$ P, J $\rightarrow$ S
  - To deal with SD $\rightarrow$ P, decompose into SDP, CSJDQV.
  - To deal with J $\rightarrow$ S, decompose CSJDQV into JS and CJDQV
- In general, several dependencies may cause violation of BCNF. The order in which we ``deal with'' them could lead to very different sets of relations!

Example of BCNF Decomposition

R = (*branch-name, branch-city, assets, customer-name, loan-number, amount*)

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

Key = {*loan-number, customer-name*}

Decomposition

- R_1 = (*branch-name, branch-city, assets*)
- R_2 = (*branch-name, customer-name, loan-number, amount*)
- R_3 = (*branch-name, loan-number, amount*)
- R_4 = (*customer-name, loan-number*)

Final decomposition

R_1, R_3, R_4

Dependency Preserving Decomposition

- Consider CSJDPQV, C is key, JP $\rightarrow$ C and SD $\rightarrow$ P.
  - BCNF decomposition: CSJDQV and SDP
  - Problem: Checking JP $\rightarrow$ C requires a join!
- Dependency preserving decomposition:
  - If R is decomposed into X, Y and Z, and we enforce the FDs that hold on X, on Y and on Z, then all FDs that were given to hold on R must also hold.
  - I.e., we should be able to check all functional dependencies on individual tables without doing joins

BCNF and Dependency Preservation

- In general, there may not be a dependency preserving decomposition into BCNF.
  - e.g., CSZ, CS $\rightarrow$ Z, Z $\rightarrow$ C
  - Can't decompose while preserving 1st FD; not in BCNF.
- Similarly, decomposition of CSJDPQV into SDP, JS and CJDQV is not dependency preserving (w.r.t. the FDs JP $\rightarrow$ C, SD $\rightarrow$ P and J $\rightarrow$ S).
  - However, it is a lossless join decomposition.
  - In this case, adding JPC to the collection of relations gives us a dependency preserving decomposition.
    - JPC tuples stored only for checking FD! (*Redundancy!*)

Third Normal Form (3NF)

- Reln R with FDs *F* is in 3NF if, for all X $\rightarrow$ A in F^+
  - A $\in$ X (called a *trivial* FD), or
  - X contains a key for R, or
  - A is part of some key for R.
- *Minimality* of a key is crucial in third condition above!
- If R is in BCNF, obviously in 3NF.
- If R is in 3NF, some redundancy is possible. It is a compromise, used when BCNF not achievable (e.g., no ``good'' decomp, or performance considerations).
  - *Lossless-join, dependency-preserving decomposition of R into a collection of 3NF relations always possible.*

Summary of Schema Refinement

- If a relation is in BCNF, it is free of redundancies that can be detected using FDs. Thus, trying to ensure that all relations are in BCNF is a good heuristic.
- If a relation is not in BCNF, we can try to decompose it into a collection of BCNF relations.
  - Must consider whether all FDs are preserved. If a lossless-join, dependency preserving decomposition into BCNF is not possible (or unsuitable, given typical queries), should consider decomposition into 3NF.
  - Decompositions should be carried out and/or re-examined while keeping *performance requirements* in mind.