```
 \begin{aligned} \textit{result} &:= \{R\}; \\ \textit{done} &:= \text{false}; \\ \textbf{while (not done) do} \\ \textbf{if (there is a schema } R_i \text{ in } \textit{result} \text{ that is not in BCNF)} \\ \textbf{then begin} \\ & \text{let } \alpha \rightarrow \beta \text{ be a nontrivial functional dependency that holds} \\ & \text{on } R_i \text{ such that } \alpha^+ \text{ does not contain } R_i \text{ and } \alpha \cap \beta = \emptyset; \\ & \textit{result} := (\textit{result} - R_i) \cup (R_i - \beta) \cup (\alpha, \beta); \\ & \textbf{end} \\ & \textbf{else } \textit{done} := \text{true}; \end{aligned}
```

Figure 7.11 BCNF decomposition algorithm.

Unfortunately, the latter procedure does not work when a relation schema is decomposed. That is, it *does not* suffice to use F when we test a relation schema R_i , in a decomposition of R, for violation of BCNF. For example, consider relation schema (A, B, C, D, E), with functional dependencies F containing $A \rightarrow B$ and $BC \rightarrow D$. Suppose this were decomposed into (A, B) and (A, C, D, E). Now, neither of the dependencies in F contains only attributes from (A, C, D, E), so we might be misled into thinking that it is in BCNF. In fact, there is a dependency $AC \rightarrow D$ in F^+ (which can be inferred using the pseudotransitivity rule from the two dependencies in F) that shows that (A, C, D, E) is not in BCNF. Thus, we may need a dependency that is in F^+ , but is not in F, to show that a decomposed relation is not in BCNF.

An alternative BCNF test is sometimes easier than computing every dependency in F^+ . To check if a relation schema R_i in a decomposition of R is in BCNF, we apply this test:

For every subset α of attributes in R_i , check that α^+ (the attribute closure of α under F) either includes no attribute of R_i – α , or includes all attributes of R_i .

If the condition is violated by some set of attributes α in R_i , consider the following functional dependency, which can be shown to be present in F^+ :

$$\alpha \to (\alpha^+ - \alpha) \cap R_i$$
.

This dependency shows that R_i violates BCNF.

7.5.1.2 BCNF Decomposition Algorithm

We are now able to state a general method to decompose a relation schema so as to satisfy BCNF. Figure 7.11 shows an algorithm for this task. If R is not in BCNF, we can decompose R into a collection of BCNF schemas R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n by the algorithm.