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**Section-01-Queries:**

1. Write a query to print the number of employees per department in the organisation.

Ans-

SELECT DEPARTMENT,COUNT(EMPLOYEE\_ID)

FROM Employee

GROUP BY DEPARTMENT;

1. Write a query to find the total incentive received by a given employee in a given month

Ans- SELECT EMPLOYEE\_REF\_ID,INCENTIVE\_DATE,Sum(INCENTIVE\_AMOUNT)

FROM Incentives

GROUP BY INCENTIVE\_DATE,

ORDER BY Sum(INCENTIVE\_AMOUNT);

1. Write a query to find the month where employees got maximum incentive

Ans- SELECT INCENTIVE\_DATE

FROM Incentives

GROUP BY INCENTIVE\_DATE where INCENTIVE\_AMOUNT=max(INCENTIVE\_AMOUNT);

Section-02-

**5.**Let’s proceed to answer and for easy understanding we will break it in steps:

Step 1. Start the 7 minute sand timer and the 4 minute sand timer.

Step 2. Once the 4 minute sand timer ends turn it upside down instantly.

Time Elapsed: 4 minutes. At this moment, 3 minutes of sand is left in the 7 minute sand timer.

Step3. Once the 7 minute sand timer ends turn it upside down instantly.

Time Elapsed: 7 minutes. At this moment, 1 minutes of sand is left in the 4 minute sand timer.

Step 4. After the 4 minute sand timer ends, only 1 minute is elapsed in 7 minute sand timer, therefore for another minute turn the 7 minute sand timer upside down.

Time Elapsed: 8 minutes.

Step5. When the 7 minute sand timer ends, total time elapsed is 9 minutes.

So effectively 8 + 1 = 9.

**6.**Since the question says one kid is a girl, it could be either be the first or second kid, which means the sample space now is BG,GG,GB.As per the question, favourable event –GG. Therefore, the probability is 1/3.

But if the question clarifies that the first kid is girl, then the probability of second kid being a girl is 1/2 .

**7.**

The given argument is flawed because it fails to supply sufficient support in favor of the argument. The argument, as it stands, is based on questionable assumptions and a faulty line of reasoning, a fact which renders it over-simplistic and unconvincing.

First of all, the author assumes that it was the local radio advertisement and not some other mean of advertisement that led to the “successs” of Ron’s Café. What if the café provided better food or a new menu, better service or resorted to a renovation and new chefs? In addition, the ten percent increase may have been the result of some other economic variables, unknown to us, that led to an improvement of the whole economy. The author should have provided a more direct link between advertising and “success” by providing proof.

Second, is the argument implies that the demographics of the radio listeners coincide with the café’s customers and habits, and assumes that the radio station has a significant reputation and a pool of listeners that is able to affect the probability of a business. But the author does not back up his thesis any relevant information such as advertising time, an estimation of radio listeners or a confirmation that the advertisements were heard by listeners at all. As it is not same to broadcast advertisements early in the morning and late in the night.

At last, the author concludes that what is true for Ron’s Café will likewise be true for most other businesses. But , there is no background to base this assumption. What if the local radio station specializes in topics such as cafeterias and night life, so that the target group of advertisements is mainly concerned with entertainment? We cannot safely assume that because a small cafeteria has benefited from radio advertising, every other local businesses will benefit at all.

To conclude, based on unsubstantiated assumptions and poor evidence, the author’s reasoning does not provide concrete support for his/her conclusions. If the argument had included the items discussed above , it would have been more thorough and convincing.