

Relational Algebra

Computer Science Department
Columbia University

Relational Query Languages

- ❖ Query languages: Allow manipulation and retrieval of data from a database.
- ❖ Relational model supports simple, powerful QLs:
 - Strong formal foundation based on logic.
 - Allows for much optimization.
- ❖ Query Languages != programming languages!
 - QLs not expected to be “Turing complete”.
 - QLs not intended to be used for complex calculations.
 - QLs support easy, efficient access to large data sets.

Formal Relational Query Languages

- ❖ Two mathematical Query Languages form the basis for “real” languages (e.g. SQL), and for implementation:
 - Relational Algebra: More **operational**, very useful for representing execution plans.
 - Relational Calculus: Lets users describe what they want, rather than how to compute it. (**Non-operational**, declarative.)

Preliminaries

- ❖ A query is applied to *relation instances*, and the result of a query is also a relation instance.
 - *Schemas of input* relations for a query are *fixed* (but query will run regardless of instance!)
 - The *schema for the result* of a given query is also *fixed*! Determined by definition of query language constructs.
- ❖ Positional vs. named-field notation:
 - Positional notation easier for formal definitions, named-field notation more readable.
 - Both used in SQL

Relational Algebra

❖ Basic operations:

- Selection (σ) Selects a subset of rows from relation.
- Projection (π) Deletes unwanted columns from relation.
- Cross-product (\times) Allows us to combine two relations.
- Set-difference ($-$) Tuples in reln. 1, but not in reln. 2.
- Union (\cup) Tuples in reln. 1 and in reln. 2.

❖ Additional operations:

- Intersection, join, division, renaming: Not essential, but (very!) useful.

❖ Since each operation returns a relation, **operations can be composed!** (Algebra is “closed”.)

Example Instances

R1

| <u>sid</u> | <u>bid</u> | <u>day</u> |
|------------|------------|------------|
| 22 | 101 | 10/10/96 |
| 58 | 103 | 11/12/96 |

S1

| <u>sid</u> | sname | rating | age |
|------------|--------|--------|------|
| 22 | dustin | 7 | 45.0 |
| 31 | lubber | 8 | 55.5 |
| 58 | rusty | 10 | 35.0 |

S2

| <u>sid</u> | sname | rating | age |
|------------|--------|--------|------|
| 28 | yuppy | 9 | 35.0 |
| 31 | lubber | 8 | 55.5 |
| 44 | guppy | 5 | 35.0 |
| 58 | rusty | 10 | 35.0 |

- ❖ “Sailors” and “Reserves” relations for our examples.
- ❖ We’ll use positional or named field notation. Names of fields in results are taken from field names in query input relations.

B1

| <u>bid</u> | bname | color |
|------------|-----------|-------|
| 101 | interlake | blue |
| 102 | interlake | red |
| 103 | clipper | green |
| 104 | marine | red |

Projection

- ❖ Deletes attributes that are not in *projection list*.
- ❖ *Schema* of result contains exactly the fields in the projection list, with the same names that they had in the (only) input relation.
- ❖ Projection operator has to eliminate *duplicates*! (Why??)
 - Note: real systems typically don't do duplicate elimination unless the user explicitly asks for it. (Why not?)

| sname | rating |
|--------|--------|
| yuppy | 9 |
| lubber | 8 |
| guppy | 5 |
| rusty | 10 |

$\pi_{sname, rating}(S2)$

| age |
|------|
| 35.0 |
| 55.5 |

$\pi_{age}(S2)$

Selection

- ❖ Selects rows that satisfy *selection condition*.
- ❖ No duplicates in result! (Why?)
- ❖ *Schema* of result identical to schema of (only) input relation.
- ❖ *Result* relation can be the *input* for another relational algebra operation! (*Operator composition*.)

| sid | sname | rating | age |
|-----|-------|--------|------|
| 28 | yuppy | 9 | 35.0 |
| 58 | rusty | 10 | 35.0 |

$$\sigma_{rating > 8}(S2)$$

| sname | rating |
|-------|--------|
| yuppy | 9 |
| rusty | 10 |

$$\pi_{sname, rating}(\sigma_{rating > 8}(S2))$$

Union, Intersection, Set-Difference

- ❖ All of these operations take two input relations, which must be union-compatible:
 - Same number of fields.
 - ‘Corresponding’ fields have the same type.
- ❖ What is the *schema* of result?

| sid | sname | rating | age |
|-----|--------|--------|------|
| 22 | dustin | 7 | 45.0 |
| 31 | lubber | 8 | 55.5 |
| 58 | rusty | 10 | 35.0 |
| 44 | guppy | 5 | 35.0 |
| 28 | yuppy | 9 | 35.0 |

$S1 \cup S2$

| sid | sname | rating | age |
|-----|--------|--------|------|
| 22 | dustin | 7 | 45.0 |

$S1 - S2$

| sid | sname | rating | age |
|-----|--------|--------|------|
| 31 | lubber | 8 | 55.5 |
| 58 | rusty | 10 | 35.0 |

$S1 \cap S2$

Cross-Product $S1 \times R1$

- ❖ Each row of S1 is paired with each row of R1.
- ❖ *Result schema* has one field per field of S1 and R1, with field names 'inherited' if possible.
 - *Conflict*: Both S1 and R1 have a field called *sid*.

| (sid) | sname | rating | age | (sid) | bid | day |
|-------|--------|--------|------|-------|-----|----------|
| 22 | dustin | 7 | 45.0 | 22 | 101 | 10/10/96 |
| 22 | dustin | 7 | 45.0 | 58 | 103 | 11/12/96 |
| 31 | lubber | 8 | 55.5 | 22 | 101 | 10/10/96 |
| 31 | lubber | 8 | 55.5 | 58 | 103 | 11/12/96 |
| 58 | rusty | 10 | 35.0 | 22 | 101 | 10/10/96 |
| 58 | rusty | 10 | 35.0 | 58 | 103 | 11/12/96 |

- Renaming operator: $\rho (C(1 \rightarrow sid1, 5 \rightarrow sid2), S1 \times R1)$

Joins

❖ Condition Join: $R \bowtie_c S = \sigma_c (R \times S)$

| (sid) | sname | rating | age | (sid) | bid | day |
|-------|--------|--------|------|-------|-----|----------|
| 22 | dustin | 7 | 45.0 | 58 | 103 | 11/12/96 |
| 31 | lubber | 8 | 55.5 | 58 | 103 | 11/12/96 |

$$S1 \bowtie_{S1.sid < R1.sid} R1$$

- ❖ *Result schema* same as that of cross-product.
- ❖ Fewer tuples than cross-product, might be able to compute more efficiently

Equi-Join and Natural Join

- ❖ Equi-Join: A special case of condition join where the condition c contains only *equalities*.

| sid | sname | rating | age | bid | day |
|-----|--------|--------|------|-----|----------|
| 22 | dustin | 7 | 45.0 | 101 | 10/10/96 |
| 58 | rusty | 10 | 35.0 | 103 | 11/12/96 |

$$S1 \bowtie_{sid} R1$$

- ❖ Result schema similar to cross-product, but only one copy of fields for which equality is specified.
- ❖ Natural Join: Equijoin on *all* common fields.

Division

- ❖ Not supported as a primitive operator, but useful for expressing queries like:

Find sailors who have reserved all boats.

- ❖ Let A have 2 fields, x and y ; B have only field y :
 - $A/B = \{ \langle x \rangle \mid \exists \langle x, y \rangle \in A \ \forall \langle y \rangle \in B \}$
 - i.e., **A/B contains all x tuples (sailors) such that for every y tuple (boat) in B , there is an xy tuple in A .**
 - Or: If the set of y values (boats) associated with an x value (sailor) in A contains all y values in B , the x value is in A/B .
- ❖ In general, x and y can be any lists of fields; y is the list of fields in B , and $x \cup y$ is the list of fields of A .

Examples of Division A/B

| sno | pno |
|-----|-----|
| s1 | p1 |
| s1 | p2 |
| s1 | p3 |
| s1 | p4 |
| s2 | p1 |
| s2 | p2 |
| s3 | p2 |
| s4 | p2 |
| s4 | p4 |

A

| pno |
|-----|
| p2 |

B1

| sno |
|-----|
| s1 |
| s2 |
| s3 |
| s4 |

A/B1

| pno |
|-----|
| p2 |
| p4 |

B2

| sno |
|-----|
| s1 |
| s4 |

A/B2

| pno |
|-----|
| p1 |
| p2 |
| p4 |

B3

| sno |
|-----|
| s1 |

A/B3

Expressing A/B Using Basic Operators

- ❖ Division is not essential op; just a useful shorthand.
 - (Also true of joins, but joins are so common that systems implement joins specially.)
- ❖ *Idea*: For A/B , compute all x values that are not 'disqualified' by some y value in B .
 - x value is *disqualified* if by attaching y value from B , we obtain an xy tuple that is not in A .

Disqualified x values: $\pi_x ((\pi_x(A) \times B) - A)$

A/B : $\pi_x(A) -$ all disqualified tuples

Find names of sailors who've reserved boat #103

❖ **Solution 1:** $\pi_{sname}((\sigma_{bid=103} Reserves) \bowtie Sailors)$

❖ **Solution 2:** $\rho(Temp1, \sigma_{bid=103} Reserves)$

$\rho(Temp2, Temp1 \bowtie Sailors)$

$\pi_{sname}(Temp2)$

❖ **Solution 3:** $\pi_{sname}(\sigma_{bid=103}(Reserves \bowtie Sailors))$

Find names of sailors who've reserved a red boat

- ❖ Information about boat color only available in Boats; so need an extra join:

$$\pi_{sname}((\sigma_{color='red'} Boats) \bowtie Reserves \bowtie Sailors)$$

- ❖ Another solution:

$$\pi_{sname}(\pi_{sid}((\pi_{bid} \sigma_{color='red'} Boats) \bowtie Res) \bowtie Sailors)$$

A query optimizer can find this, given the first solution!

Find sailors who've reserved a red or a green boat

- ❖ Identify all red or green boats, then find sailors who've reserved one of these boats:

$$\rho \text{ (Tempboats, } (\sigma_{color='red' \vee color='green'} \text{ Boats}))$$

$$\pi_{sname}(\text{Tempboats} \bowtie \text{Reserves} \bowtie \text{Sailors})$$

- ❖ Can also define Tempboats using union! (How?)
- ❖ What happens if \vee is replaced by \wedge in this query?

Find the names of sailors who've reserved a red and a green boat

- ❖ Previous approach won't work! Must identify sailors who've reserved red boats, sailors who've reserved green boats, then find the intersection (note that *sid* is a key for *Sailors*):

$$\rho \text{ (Tempred, } \pi_{sid}((\sigma_{color='red'} Boats) \bowtie Reserves))$$
$$\rho \text{ (Tempgreen, } \pi_{sid}((\sigma_{color='green'} Boats) \bowtie Reserves))$$
$$\pi_{sname}((Tempred \cap Tempgreen) \bowtie Sailors)$$

Find the names of sailors who've reserved all boats

- ❖ Uses division; schemas of the input relations to / must be carefully chosen:

$$\rho \text{ (Tempsids, } (\pi_{sid,bid} \text{Reserves}) / (\pi_{bid} \text{Boats}))$$

$$\pi_{sname} (\text{Tempsids} \bowtie \text{Sailors})$$

- ❖ To find sailors who've reserved all 'Interlake' boats:

$$\dots / \pi_{bid} (\sigma_{bname='Interlake'} \text{Boats})$$

Summary

- ❖ The relational model has rigorously defined query languages that are simple and powerful.
- ❖ Relational algebra is more operational; useful as internal representation for query evaluation plans.
- ❖ Several ways of expressing a given query; a query optimizer should choose the most efficient version.