

# PART 1: FUNCTIONAL DEPENDENCIES

# Functional dependencies

- Let  $X, Y$  be sets of attributes from relation  $R$
- $X \rightarrow Y$  (we say: “ $X$  *functionally determines*  $Y$ ”)
  - Any tuples in  $R$  which agree in all attributes of  $X$  must also agree in all attributes of  $Y$
- $X \rightarrow A$  (“ $X$  determines  $A$ ”) is an assertion about a relation  $R$ :
  - whenever two tuples of  $R$  agree on all the attributes of  $X$ , then they must also agree on the attribute  $A$
  - $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$  implies  $t_1[A] = t_2[A]$  for all  $t_1, t_2$  in  $R$  (analogously for  $X \rightarrow Y$ )

# Functional dependencies

Roll_No	Student_Name	Dept_Name	Dept_Building
2	abc	CS	A4
3	pqr	IT	A3
4	xyz	CS	A4
5	xyz	IT	A3
6	mno	EC	B2
7	jkl	ME	B2

# Functional dependencies

Table Drinkers(name, addr, beersLiked, manf, favBeer)

name	addr	beersLiked	manf	favBeer
Janeway	Voyager	Bud	A.B.	WickedAle
Janeway	Voyager	WickedAle	Pete's	WickedAle
Spock	Enterprise	Bud	A.B.	Bud

# Functional dependencies

Table `Drinkers(name, addr, beersLiked, manf, favBeer)`

<code>name</code>	<code>addr</code>	<code>beersLiked</code>	<code>manf</code>	<code>favBeer</code>
Janeway	Voyager	Bud	A.B.	WickedAle
Janeway	Voyager	WickedAle	Pete's	WickedAle
Spock	Enterprise	Bud	A.B.	Bud

Reasonable FD's to assert:

1. `name`  $\rightarrow$  `addr`

2. `name`  $\rightarrow$  `favBeer`

3. `beersLiked`  $\rightarrow$  `manf`

# Functional dependencies

name	addr	beersLiked	manf	favBeer
Janeway	Voyager	Bud	A.B.	WickedAle
Janeway	Voyager	WickedAle	Pete's	WickedAle
Spock	Enterprise	Bud	A.B.	Bud

Because of  $\text{name} \rightarrow \text{addr}$

Because of  $\text{name} \rightarrow \text{favBeer}$

Because of  $\text{beersLiked} \rightarrow \text{manf}$

# FD

Given the following attributes, identify all the functional dependencies:

- shipment\_id
- shipment\_date
- origin
- destination
- ship\_id
- ship\_name
- captain\_id
- captain\_name
- item\_id
- description
- weight
- quantity

# Rules and principles about FDs

- Rules
  - The splitting/combining rule
  - Trivial FDs
  - The transitive rule
- Algorithms related to FDs
  - the closure of a set of attributes of a relation



# The Splitting/Combining rule of FDs

- Attributes on right **independent** of each other
  - Consider  $a,b,c \rightarrow d,e,f$
  - “Attributes a, b, and c functionally determine d, e, and f”  
=> No mention of d relating to e or f directly
- Splitting rule (useful to split up right side of FD)
  - $abc \rightarrow def$  becomes  $abc \rightarrow d$ ,  $abc \rightarrow e$  and  $abc \rightarrow f$
- No safe way to split left side
  - $abc \rightarrow def$  is NOT the same as  $ab \rightarrow def$  and  $c \rightarrow def$ !
- Combining rule (useful to combine right sides):
  - if  $abc \rightarrow d$ ,  $abc \rightarrow e$ ,  $abc \rightarrow f$  holds, then  $abc \rightarrow def$  holds

# Splitting FDs – example

- Consider the relation and FD
  - EmailAddress(user, domain, firstName, lastName)
  - user, domain  $\rightarrow$  firstName, lastName
- The following hold
  - user, domain  $\rightarrow$  firstName
  - user, domain  $\rightarrow$  lastName
- The following do **NOT** hold!
  - user  $\rightarrow$  firstName, lastName
  - domain  $\rightarrow$  firstName, lastName

# Trivial FDs

- Not all functional dependencies are useful
  - $A \rightarrow A$  always holds
  - $abc \rightarrow a$  also always holds (right side is subset of left side)
- FD with an attribute on both sides is “trivial”
  - Simplify by removing  $L \cap R$  from  $R$   
 $abc \rightarrow ad$  becomes  $abc \rightarrow d$
  - Or, in singleton form, delete trivial FDs  
 $abc \rightarrow a$  and  $abc \rightarrow d$  becomes just  $abc \rightarrow d$

# Transitive rule

- The transitive rule holds for FDs
  - Consider the FDs:  $a \rightarrow b$  and  $b \rightarrow c$ ; then  $a \rightarrow c$  holds
  - Consider the FDs:  $ad \rightarrow b$  and  $b \rightarrow cd$ ; then  $ad \rightarrow cd$  holds or just  $ad \rightarrow c$  (because of the trivial dependency rule)