
Part 1: Database Implementation

Database Connection (Local):



DDL Implementation

```
DROP DATABASE IF EXISTS StudyGroup;

CREATE DATABASE StudyGroup;

USE StudyGroup;


CREATE TABLE Users(
    user_id INT PRIMARY KEY,
    email VARCHAR(50),
    password CHAR(100),
    study_pref CHAR(100)

);


CREATE TABLE StudyGroup (
    group_id INT PRIMARY KEY,
```


```
manager_id INT NOT NULL,
   group_name VARCHAR(50),
   group_size INT,
  group_id INT NOT NULL,
   PRIMARY KEY(user_id, group_id),
   FOREIGN KEY(group_id) REFERENCES StudyGroup(group_id) ON DELETE CASCADE
   group_id INT NOT NULL,
   PRIMARY KEY(avail_id, group_id),
   FOREIGN KEY(group_id) REFERENCES StudyGroup(group_id) ON DELETE CASCADE
CREATE TABLE Courses (
  group_id INT NOT NULL,
   PRIMARY KEY(group_id, CRN),
   FOREIGN KEY(group_id) REFERENCES StudyGroup(group_id) ON DELETE CASCADE,
CREATE TABLE Locations (
```

```
building_name VARCHAR(50),
PRIMARY KEY(group_id, location_id),
FOREIGN KEY(group_id) REFERENCES StudyGroup(group_id) ON DELETE CASCADE,
FOREIGN KEY(contact_id) REFERENCES Contacts(contact_id) ON DELETE CASCADE,
FOREIGN KEY(user_id) REFERENCES Users(user_id) ON DELETE CASCADE
```



>=1000 Rows Insertion





Part 2: Advanced Queries

Query 1

- 1. Selects the number of groups in each department that study courses whose course code is between 500 and 600
 - a. Example Query for search filter

SELECT COUNT(g.group_id), c.department
FROM studygroup AS g
JOIN group_courses AS gc
ON g.group_id = gc.group_id
JOIN courses AS c
ON gc.CRN = c.CRN
WHERE c.course_code BETWEEN 500 and 600
GROUP BY c.department;

Result:

	COUNT(g.group_id)	department
•	53	ACCY
	2	AE
	2	ARCH
	1	ATMS
	35	BADM
	2	BDI
	2	BIOE
	2	CHBE
	3	CHEM
	5	CHLH
	2	CI
	14	CS
	13	ECE

Query 2

- 2. Selects most common subjects, that offers more than 40 courses
 - a. Example Query for searching for classes when making a study group

SELECT DISTINCT course_name, department Subject FROM Courses
WHERE department IN
(SELECT department FROM Courses
GROUP BY department
HAVING COUNT(department) > 40);

ourse_name	Subject
undergraduate open seminar	MATH
Mgmt and Organizational Beh	BADM
Operations Strategy	BADM
Strategic Human Res Management	BADM
Fundamentals of Accounting	ACCY
Accounting Analysis I A	ACCY
Accounting Analysis II	ACCY
Multinational Management	BADM
Quantitative Analysis Lecture	CHEM
Inorganic Chemistry	CHEM
Instrumental Characterization	CHEM
Elementary Organic Chem II	CHEM
Electronic Music Synthesis	ECE
Computer Organization & Design	ECE
Physical Organic Chemistry	CHEM
Senior Design Project Lab	ECE
Power Electronics	ECE


- 3. Searches based on a specific compatible time
 - a. Example Query for search filter

SELECT u.user_id, email FROM Users AS u
JOIN Membership AS m
ON u.user_id = m.user_id
JOIN studygroup AS s
ON m.group_id = s.group_id
WHERE s.group_id IN
(SELECT DISTINCT group_id
FROM Availability AS a
WHERE a.start_time
IN ('20:00:00', '21:00:00', '22:00:00')
AND day_of_week IN (1,2));
Result:

```
147 skxelb87@illinois.edu
        goqize 14@illinois.edu
152
       bvsfit92@illinois.edu
157
162
        pmekgy36@illinois.edu
167 wdxpbz61@illinois.edu
      nyxeac79@illinois.edu
177 oghvrb32@illinois.edu
        lgwtas34@illinois.edu
182
187 tcpwsd45@illinois.edu
       rzsfwj82@illinois.edu
192
197 iffwby92@illinois.edu
     muhmsc91@illinois.edu
202
207 yxuixx77@illinois.edu
212
        ymraox20@illinois.edu
217 utujld84@illinois.edu
222
     nnljvi81@illinois.edu
227 daikkn83@illinois.edu
232
        bhibur68@illinois.edu
237
       bvucgl77@illinois.edu
        cgjczc30@illinois.edu
242
247 uekggg68@illinois.edu
```

4. Finds out info of all classes the user joined a group of 3 or more people with

a. Example Query for User



Part 3: Index Analysis

Query 1

EXPLAIN ANALYZE:

```
-> Table scan on <temporary> (actual time=4.19..4.2 rows=13 loops=1)
-> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=4.19..4.19 rows=13 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=483 rows=297) (actual time=0.239..3.96 rows=136 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=379 rows=297) (actual time=0.206..3.55 rows=136 loops=1)
```

After adding

- For JOIN
- CREATE INDEX idx_group_courses_group_id ON Group_Courses (group_id);
- CREATE INDEX idx_courses_crn ON Courses (CRN);

```
-> Table scan on <a href="temporary">-> Table scan on <a href="temporary">-> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=4.85.4.85 rows=13 loops=1)</a>
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=483 rows=297) (actual time=0.176.4.62 rows=136 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=379 rows=297) (actual time=0.169.4.23 rows=136 loops=1)
```

- 2. For WHERE
- CREATE INDEX idx_courses_code ON Courses (course_code);

```
-> Table scan on <temporary> (actual time=2.07..2.07 rows=13 loops=1)
-> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=2.06.2.06 rows=13 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=492 rows=117) (actual time=0.0946..1.96 rows=136 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=451 rows=117) (actual time=0.0912..1.77 rows=136 loops=1)
```

- 3. For GROUP BY
- CREATE INDEX idx_courses_department ON Courses (department);

```
-> Table scan on <temporary> (actual time=5.78..5.79 rows=13 loops=1)
-> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=5.78..5.78 rows=13 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=483 rows=297) (actual time=0.214..4.49 rows=136 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=379 rows=297) (actual time=0.206..4.14 rows=136 loops=1)
```

Analysis:

- The index for the JOIN key does not decrease cost, likely because group_id and CRN are both primary keys
- 2. However, the index for WHERE increases the cost, probably because there are now more course codes to iterate through than just 500-600.
- 3. The index for GROUP BY also does not decrease cost. Using the reasoning for #1

Result: We should not use an index for optimal performance.

EXPLAIN ANALYZE:

After adding

For GROUP BY

CREATE INDEX idx_courses_department ON Courses (department);

```
-> Table scan on Scan on -> Table scan on Scan on
```

For HAVING

CREATE INDEX idx_courses_course_name ON Courses (course_name);

```
-> Table scan on <a href="temporary">-> Table scan on <a href="temporary">-> Temporary</a> (cost=542..578 rows=2673) (actual time=9.69..9.93 rows=625 loops=1)
-> Temporary table with deduplication (cost=542..542 rows=2673) (actual time=9.69..9.69 rows=625 loops=1)
-> Filter: <a href="temporary">-> Titler: <a href="temporary">-> Titler: <a href="temporary">-> Titler: <a href="temporary">-> Titler: <a href="temporary">-> Table scan on Courses (cost=275 rows=2673) (actual time=0.216..2.46 rows=2736 loops=1)
-> Table scan on Courses (cost=275 rows=2673) (actual time=0.216..2.46 rows=2736 loops=1)
```

Analysis:

- Indexing does not increase or decrease computational cost for this query.
- "department" is used in both filtering (`WHERE`) and grouping (`GROUP BY`). However, the subquery aggregates all the rows by `department`, and the cost is dominated by the aggregation step rather than by locating specific values.
- The DISTINCT operations require sorting to ensure uniqueness of "course_name". The index on "course_name" does not reduce the cost of this operation because the DISTINCT operations still need to evaluate all unique values across all rows.

Result: Indices are unnecessary for this query

Query 3

EXPLAIN ANALYZE:

EXPLAIN:

-> Nested loop inner join (cost=11.9 rows=10) (actual time=0.0613..0.0815 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=10.6 rows=10) (actual time=0.0573..0.0724 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=9.39 rows=10) (actual time=0.049..0.0585 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Table scan on <subquery2> (cost=3.53..5.89 rows=10) (actual time=0.0421..0.0426 rows=6 loops=1)

After Adding:

1. FOR WHERE

CREATE INDEX group_idx ON studygroup(group_id);

EXPLAIN:

```
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=11.9 rows=10) (actual time=0.0765..0.119 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=10.6 rows=10) (actual time=0.0717..0.105 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=9.39 rows=10) (actual time=0.0648..0.0872 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Table scan on <subquery2> (cost=3.53..5.89 rows=10) (actual time=0.055..0.0563 rows=6 loops=1)
```

- 2. FOR WHERE (in SELECT subquery)
 - CREATE INDEX day_idx ON availability(day_of_week);
 - CREATE INDEX time_idx ON availability(start_time);

EXPLAIN:

```
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=11.9 rows=10) (actual time=0.0765..0.119 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=10.6 rows=10) (actual time=0.0717..0.105 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=9.39 rows=10) (actual time=0.0648..0.0872 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Table scan on <subquery2> (cost=3.53..5.89 rows=10) (actual time=0.055..0.0563 rows=6 loops=1)
```

FOR JOIN

CREATE INDEX user_idx ON users(user_id);

EXPLAIN:

```
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=11.9 rows=10) (actual time=0.227..0.276 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=10.6 rows=10) (actual time=0.222..0.26 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=9.39 rows=10) (actual time=0.211..0.237 rows=6 loops=1)
-> Table scan on <subquery2> (cost=3.53..5.89 rows=10) (actual time=0.18..0.182 rows=6 loops=1)
```

Analysis:

- The index for WHERE does not reduce the cost, likely because group_id is a primary key
- The first index for WHERE in the SELECT subquery also does not reduce the cost, likely because the SELECT DISTINCT already makes the query check for unique values
- 3. The second index for WHERE in the SELECT subquery also does not reduce the cost, using the same reasoning as above.
- 4. The index in JOIN does not reduce the cost, likely as there already is an index for the primary key of users.

Result: For optimal performance, we should not use an index

Index: CREATE INDEX email idx ON users(email);

EXPLAIN ANALYZE

```
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=10918 rows=9060) (actual time=2.41...3.37 rows=30 loops=1)
-> Inner hash join (m.group_id = `<subquery2>`.group_id) (cost=9987 rows=9060) (actual time=2.38...3.28 rows=30 loops=1)
-> Filter: (m.user_id is not null) (cost=0.11 rows=100) (actual time=0.0177...0.885 rows=1000 loops=1)
-> Table scan on m (cost=0.11 rows=1000) (actual time=0.0164..0.784 rows=1000 loops=1)
```

After adding

- for JOIN
- CREATE INDEX CRN_idx on Group_Courses(CRN);
- CREATE INDEX group_idx on studygroup(group_id);

```
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=234 rows=100) (actual time=0.767..0.782 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=199 rows=100) (actual time=0.758..0.773 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=188 rows=100) (actual time=0.739..0.754 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Table scan on <subquery2> (cost=150..153 rows=100) (actual time=0.724..0.737 rows=1 loops=1)
```

- 2. for JOIN (in SELECT subquery)
- CREATE INDEX user idx ON membership(user id);

```
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=234 rows=100) (actual time=0.767..0.782 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=199 rows=100) (actual time=0.758..0.773 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=188 rows=100) (actual time=0.739..0.754 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Table scan on <subquery2> (cost=150..153 rows=100) (actual time=0.724..0.737 rows=1 loops=1)
```

- 3. for WHERE (in SELECT subquery)
- CREATE INDEX email_idx ON users(email);

```
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=2.13 rows=1) (actual time=0.237..0.253 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Remove duplicate (gc, g) rows using temporary table (weedout) (cost=1.78 rows=1) (actual time=0.207..0.223 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=1.78 rows=1) (actual time=0.197..0.213 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=1.43 rows=1) (actual time=0.155..0.17 rows=1 loops=1)
```

Analysis:

- 1. The index for the JOIN keys did not decrease cost. This is because these indexes are already included in the default indexes, being the primary keys for each table included in the joins.
- 2. The index for the JOIN keys (in SELECT subquery) did not decrease cost. Using the same logic as above. Note that this also applies to trying to add an index on group_id in the WHERE clause.
- 3. The only index that decreased cost. By providing an index for a column in a subquery, I was able to make the subquery more efficient. Because the subquery was in several nested loops due from inner joins, the overall query became a lot more efficient.

Result: We need the following index for enhanced performance:

CREATE INDEX email_idx ON users(email);