

TRƯỜNG ĐẠI HỌC FPT HỒ CHÍ MINH

-----□□□□□-----



FPT UNIVERSITY

COURSE: DBI202 - DATABASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS
LAB 3: ANOMALY DETECTION AND
NORMALIZATION

GROUP: ...1.....

ACADEMIC YEAR:2025-2026.....

TP. HỒ CHÍ MINH, THÁNG 1/2026

TRƯỜNG ĐẠI HỌC FPT HỒ CHÍ MINH

-----?????-----

COURSE:

DBI202 - DATABASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

LAB 3: ANOMALY DETECTION AND NORMALIZATION

Group: 1	
Group Members	<Trần Minh Huy> - <SE203499> <Lê Hoàng Bách(Leader)> - <SE201089> <Nguyễn Thu Kỳ> - <SE203407> <Trần Thành Đạt> - <SE203479>
Lecturer	VanTTN
Class	AI2009

Table of Contents

1. Objective of the Lab
2. Analysis of Anomalies
 - 2.1. Redundancy
 - 2.2. Insertion Anomaly
 - 2.3. Update Anomaly
 - 2.4. Deletion Anomaly
3. Identification of Normal Forms
 - 3.1. First Normal Form (1NF)
 - 3.2. Second Normal Form (2NF)
 - 3.3. Third Normal Form (3NF)
 - 3.4. Boyce–Codd Normal Form (BCNF)
4. Step-by-Step Decomposition
5. Final Normalized Schema
6. Conclusion

1. Objective

The objective of this laboratory is to analyze the relational database schema developed in Lab 2 and evaluate it from the perspective of anomaly detection and normalization.

This lab focuses on identifying common database anomalies, including redundancy, insertion, update, and deletion anomalies, which may occur in poorly designed schemas.

In addition, normalization techniques are applied and justified step by step to ensure that the final schema satisfies higher normal forms, particularly Third Normal Form (3NF) and Boyce–Codd Normal Form (BCNF).

The final goal is to confirm that the database design is efficient, consistent, and suitable for real-world cinema ticket booking systems.

2. Analysis of Anomalies

In this section, we analyze the schema from Lab 2 for redundancy, update anomalies, insertion anomalies, and deletion anomalies. The schema consists of 12 relations (entities): Movie, Cinema, ScreeningRoom, Seat, SeatType, Showtime, Customer, Booking, Ticket, Payment, Staff, and Discount. Each relation is evaluated individually because the overall design has already been decomposed into separate tables. We provide clear examples of potential anomalies, focusing on hypothetical scenarios in which anomalies could arise if the schema were not properly designed. Actual anomalies in the current schema are minimal due to the use of surrogate keys and full functional dependencies (FDs). To maximize analytical depth (as per the rubric's Decomposition and Pattern Recognition), we break down the analysis plan and use AI tools to verify potential implied FDs and anomalies through simulated data examples.

2.1. Redundancy

- **Movie:**
No redundancy exists because each movie stores unique attributes.
Redundancy would only occur if attributes such as genre were duplicated across multiple relations.
- **Cinema:**
No redundant data is stored; each cinema record is unique.
- **Screening Room:**
No redundancy is present because room attributes depend solely on the room identifier.
- **Seat:**
No redundancy exists since seat type information is referenced viaTypeID.
Redundancy would appear if TypeName or Surcharge were stored directly in this table.
- **Seat Type:**
No redundancy; each seat type and its surcharge are stored once.

- **Showtime:**
Potential redundancy exists if EndTime is stored, as it can be derived from StartTime and movie duration.
- **Customer:**
No redundant customer data is stored.
- **Booking:**
No redundancy exists; each booking is uniquely identified.
- **Ticket:**
Potential redundancy exists because TicketPrice duplicates information derived from Showtime. Price and Seat Type. Surcharge.
- **Payment:**
No redundancy exists; each payment record is independent.
- **Staff:**
No redundancy exists in staff information.
- **Discount:**
No redundancy exists; discount data is stored only once.

2.2. Insertion Anomaly

- **Movie:**
A movie can be inserted without any showtime information.
- **Cinema:**
A cinema can be inserted without screening rooms.
- **Screening Room:**
A screening room can be inserted only if a cinema exists.
- **Seat:**
A seat can be inserted only if a screening room exists.
- **Seat Type:**
A seat type can be inserted without any seats.
- **Showtime:**
A showtime can be inserted only if the movie and screening room exist.
- **Customer:**
A customer can be inserted without making any bookings.
- **Booking:**
A booking can be inserted only if the customer, showtime, and staff exist.
- **Ticket:**
A ticket cannot be inserted without an existing booking and seat.
- **Payment:**
A payment can be inserted only if a booking exists; DiscountID is optional.
- **Staff:**
A staff member can be inserted only if the cinema exists.
- **Discount:**
A discount can be inserted without being applied to any payment.

2.3. Update Anomaly

- **Movie:**
Updating attributes such as ReleaseDate affects only one record.
An update anomaly would occur if the movie duration were duplicated in Showtime.
- **Cinema:**
Updating an address or contact details requires changing only one record.
- **Screening Room:**
Updating room capacity affects only one row.
- **Seat:**
Updating the seat position affects only one seat.
If surcharge data were stored here, updating VIP surcharge would require updating all rows.
- **Seat Type:**
Updating the surcharge automatically applies to all related seats through the ignition keys.
- **Showtime:**
Updating the price affects only one showtime.
Changing movie duration would require recalculating all related showtimes.
- **Customer:**
Updating the email or phone number affects only one row.
- **Booking:**
Updating the booking status affects only one booking.
- **Ticket:**
Updating the seat type surcharge requires updating all related ticket prices, causing an update anomaly.
- **Payment:**
Updating the payment amount or status affects only one record.
- **Staff:**
Updating a role or contact information affects only the record.
- **Discount:**
Updating the discount value affects all payments that reference it.

2.4. Deletion Anomaly

- **Movie:**
Deleting a movie removes related showtimes, controlled by foreign keys.
- **Cinema:**
Deleting a cinema may remove screening rooms and staff, but orphan data is prevented.
- **Screening Room:**
Deleting a room removes associated seats.

- **Seat:**
Deleting a seat does not affect room or seat type data.
- **Seat Type:**
Deleting a seat type removes surcharge information; deletion is restricted if seats exist.
- **Showtime:**
Deleting a showtime removes related bookings and tickets.
- **Customer:**
Deleting a customer removes booking history.
- **Booking:**
Deleting a booking removes associated tickets and payments.
- **Ticket:**
Deleting a ticket removes price information only.
- **Payment:**
Deleting a payment removes confirmation but not booking data.
- **Staff:**
Deleting staff may affect bookings associated with them.
- **Discount:**
Deleting a discount removes its application from payments.

Overall Insights: No major anomalies in the current schema due to proper entity separation and FDs. Hypothetical anomalies demonstrate risks if denormalized (e.g., combining Seat and SeatType leads to update anomalies). We used AI to simulate data insertions/deletions and confirm these examples.

3. Identification of Normal Forms:

In this section, we evaluate the database schema derived from Lab 2 using a step-by-step normalization process, following the standard progression from First Normal Form (1NF) to Boyce–Codd Normal Form (BCNF).

To apply algorithmic thinking, each normal form is checked using the same structured procedure:

1. Identify the primary key and candidate keys.
2. List the functional dependencies (FDs).
3. Check whether the rules of the normal form are satisfied by counterexamples to justify the conclusion.

3.1 First Normal Form (1NF)

Definition (Rule):

A relation is in 1NF if:

- All attributes contain atomic (indivisible) values.
- There are no repeating groups or multivalued attributes.
- Each field contains only one value per row.

Analysis of the Schema:

All relations in the schema use simple data types such as integers, strings, dates, and timestamps. Each attribute stores a single value.

Examples:

- In a movie, attributes such as *title*, *duration*, and *language* store exactly one value.
- In Customer, *Email*, and *PhoneNumber* are single-valued attributes.
- In Seat, *SeatRow*, and *SeatNumber* are stored separately and not as a combined or repeated structure.

Abstraction Applied:

We focus only on whether attributes are atomic, ignoring higher-level dependencies at this stage.

Potential Violation (Hypothetical):

If *Genre* were stored as a list (e.g., “Action, Comedy”) or if *SeatNumbers* were stored as a set in Booking, the schema would violate 1NF.

Conclusion:

All relations satisfy 1NF because:

- Attributes are atomic
- No repeating groups exist

→ The entire schema is in First Normal Form (1NF).

3.2 Second Normal Form (2NF)

Definition (Rule):

A relation is in 2NF if:

- It is already in 1NF
- Every non-key attribute is fully functionally dependent on the entire primary key
- There are no partial dependencies

Step-by-Step Evaluation:

1. Primary Key Structure

All relations use single-attribute surrogate primary keys, such as:

- MovieID
- CinemaID
- SeatID
- BookingID

Because the primary keys are not composite, partial dependency cannot exist by definition.

2. Special Case: Seat

Seat has an additional candidate key:

- (RoomID, SeatRow, SeatNumber)

However:

- The actual primary key is SeatID
- All attributes (RoomID, TypeID, SeatRow, SeatNumber) are fully dependent on SeatID

Therefore, no non-key attribute depends on only part of a composite primary key.

Pattern Recognition:

Using surrogate keys simplifies dependency structures and prevents partial dependency issues.

Conclusion:

Since

- All relations are in 1NF
- No partial dependencies exist

→ All relations satisfy Second Normal Form (2NF).

3.3 Third Normal Form (3NF)

Definition (Rule):

A relation is in 3NF if:

- It is in 2NF
- There are no transitive dependencies. Non-key attributes do not depend on other non-key attributes

Systematic Analysis:

We examine whether any attribute depends indirectly on the primary key through another non-key attribute.

Example 1: SeatType

- FD: TypeID → TypeName, Surcharge
- TypeID is the primary key.
No non-key attribute determines another non-key attribute

→ No transitive dependency

Example 2: Showtime

- FD: ShowtimeID → MovieID, StartTime, EndTime, Price
- Although MovieID → Duration (in Movie table), *Duration is not stored in Showtime*
- EndTime depends directly on ShowtimeID, not transitively via MovieID

Hypothetical Violation:

If Showtime stored *Duration* instead of referencing Movie, we would have:

ShowtimeID → MovieID → Duration

This would create a transitive dependency and violate 3NF.

Example 3: Ticket

- FD: TicketID → BookingID, SeatID, TicketPrice
- Even though SeatID → TypeID → Surcharge, TicketPrice does not functionally depend on Surcharge as an FD
- TicketPrice is treated as transactional data.

Conclusion:

All non-key attributes in every relation depend directly and only on the primary key.

→ The entire schema satisfies Third Normal Form (3NF).

3.4 Boyce–Codd Normal Form (BCNF)

Definition (Rule):

A relation is in BCNF if:

- For every functional dependency $X \rightarrow Y$, X is a superkey
- No non-key attribute acts as a determinant

Algorithmic Evaluation:

For each relation:

1. Identify all functional dependencies
2. Check whether the left-hand side of each FD is a candidate key

Example 1: Seat

- FD: $\text{SeatID} \rightarrow \text{RoomID}, \text{TypeID}, \text{SeatRow}, \text{SeatNumber}$.
- SeatID is the primary key.
- TypeID is a foreign key, but not a determinant in this table

→ BCNF satisfied

Example 2: SeatType

- FD: $\text{TypeID} \rightarrow \text{TypeName}, \text{Surcharge}$
- TypeID is the primary key

→ BCNF satisfied

Example 3: Booking

- FD: $\text{BookingID} \rightarrow \text{CustomerID}, \text{ShowtimeID}, \text{BookingDate}, \text{BookingStatus}, \text{StaffID}$
- BookingID is the only determinant

→ BCNF satisfied

Hypothetical BCNF Violation:

If SeatType were merged into Seat , we could have:

$\text{TypeName} \rightarrow \text{Surcharge}$

where TypeName is not a key → BCNF violation.

Conclusion:

All determinants in the schema are candidate keys.

→ All relations satisfy Boyce–Codd Normal Form (BCNF).

4. Step-by-Step Decomposition

The schema from Lab 2 is already in BCNF, with lossless joins (via FKs) and dependency preservation (FDs maintained). No major decomposition needed, but to demonstrate (rubric: Decomposition, Algorithmic Thinking), we assume a hypothetical unnormalized relation combining Seat , SeatType , and Ticket (common in poor designs) and decompose it step-by-step to BCNF. This ensures properties: Lossless (join reconstructs original), Dependency Preservation (FDs not lost).

Hypothetical Unnormalized Relation: SeatTicket (SeatID, RoomID, SeatRow, SeatNumber, TypeName, Surcharge, TicketID, BookingID, TicketPrice)

FDs: $\text{SeatID} \rightarrow \text{RoomID}$, $\text{SeatID} \rightarrow \text{SeatRow}$, $\text{SeatID} \rightarrow \text{SeatNumber}$, $\text{TypeName} \rightarrow \text{Surcharge}$; $\text{TypeName} \rightarrow \text{Surcharge}$ (transitive); $\text{TicketID} \rightarrow \text{BookingID}$, $\text{TicketID} \rightarrow \text{SeatID}$, $\text{TicketID} \rightarrow \text{TicketPrice}$; Implied: $\text{TicketPrice} \rightarrow \text{Surcharge} + \text{base price}$.

- **Step 1: Check 1NF** - Atomic attributes? Yes, but redundancy in $\text{TypeName}/\text{Surcharge}$ for the same types.
- **Step 2: To 2NF**—Eliminate partial dependencies. PK composite ($\text{TicketID}, \text{SeatID}$)? No partial since simple in the original. Decompose if needed: Separate $\text{Ticket}(\text{TicketID}, \text{BookingID}, \text{SeatID}, \text{TicketPrice})$.
- **Step 3: To 3NF** - Eliminate transitive: $\text{TypeName} \rightarrow \text{Surcharge}$. Decompose to $\text{SeatType}(\text{TypeName PK}, \text{Surcharge})$ and $\text{Seat}(\text{SeatID PK}, \text{RoomID}, \text{SeatRow}, \text{SeatNumber}, \text{TypeName FK})$.
- **Step 4: To BCNF** - Now, in Seat , all determinants (e.g., TypeName) are not determinants here (FK). Final: Matches Lab 2 schema.
- **Properties:** Lossless (join on $\text{TypeName}/\text{SeatID}$ reconstructs); Preservation (FD $\text{TypeName} \rightarrow \text{Surcharge}$ kept in SeatType).

For the actual schema: Minor refinement (added $\text{StaffID}/\text{DiscountID}$ in Lab 2) doesn't require further decomposition.

5. Final Normalized Schema

The final schema is the refined version from Lab 2, in BCNF. Anomalies eliminated by separation (e.g., no redundancy in surcharges; updates localized).

- **Movie:** MovieID (PK), Title, Genre, Duration, Language, ReleaseDate, AgeRestriction.
- **Cinema:** CinemaID (PK), CinemaName, Address, City, PhoneNumber.
- **ScreeningRoom:** RoomID (PK), CinemaID (FK), RoomName, Capacity.
- **Seat:** SeatID (PK), RoomID (FK), TypeID (FK), SeatRow, SeatNumber.
- **SeatType:** TypeID (PK), TypeName, Surcharge.
- **Showtime:** ShowtimeID (PK), MovieID (FK), RoomID (FK), StartTime, EndTime, Price.
- **Customer:** CustomerID (PK), FullName, Email, PhoneNumber.
- **Booking:** BookingID (PK), CustomerID (FK), ShowtimeID (FK), BookingDate, BookingStatus, StaffID (FK).
- **Ticket:** TicketID (PK), BookingID (FK), SeatID (FK), TicketPrice.
- **Payment:** PaymentID (PK), BookingID (FK), PaymentMethod, PaymentDate, PaymentAmount, PaymentStatus, DiscountID (FK optional).
- **Staff:** StaffID (PK), CinemaID (FK), FullName, Role, Email, PhoneNumber, Status.

- **Discount:** DiscountID (PK), DiscountName, DiscountType, DiscountValue, StartDate, EndDate, Status.

Anomalies eliminated: E.g., Update surcharge now only in SeatType, not repeated in seats/tickets.

6. Conclusion

This lab analyzed anomalies in the Cinema Ticket Booking schema, confirmed it meets BCNF, and demonstrated decomposition on a hypothetical relation. By applying systematic steps, we ensured data integrity and minimal redundancy. AI tools aided in verifying FDs and simulating anomalies, enhancing our understanding. The final schema provides a robust foundation for implementation. Group collaboration was strong, with clear task division for maximum efficiency.