DDL Commands for creating the tables

```
Create Table Accounts(
      UserID INT,
      Username VARCHAR(255),
      Password VARCHAR(255),
      Income FLOAT,
      MinIncome FLOAT,
      MaxIncome FLOAT,
      PRIMARY KEY(UserID),
      FOREIGN KEY(MinIncome, MaxIncome)
            REFERENCES AverageExpense(MinIncome, MaxIncome)
            ON DELETE SET NULL
)
Create Table Receipts (
      ReceiptID INT,
      UserID INT,
      PurchaseDate DATE,
      Seller VARCHAR(255),
      PRIMARY KEY (ReceiptID),
      FOREIGN KEY (UserID)
            REFERENCES Accounts(UserID)
            ON DELETE CASCADE
)
Create Table Items (
      ItemID INT,
      Category VARCHAR(255),
      ReceiptID INT,
      ItemName VARCHAR(255),
      Price FLOAT,
      PRIMARY KEY (ItemID),
      FOREIGN KEY (ReceiptId)
            REFERENCES Receipts(ReceiptID)
            ON DELETE CASCADE,
      FOREIGN KEY (Category)
            REFERENCES Budget(Category)
            ON DELETE SET NULL
)
```

```
Create Table AverageExpense (
      MinIncome FLOAT,
      MaxIncome FLOAT,
      AvgExpense FLOAT,
      PRIMARY KEY (MinIncome, MaxIncome)
)
Create Table Budget (
      Category VARCHAR(255) UNIQUE,
      UserID INT,
      Budget FLOAT,
      Spent FLOAT,
      PRIMARY KEY (Category, UserId),
      FOREIGN KEY (UserID)
            REFERENCES Accounts(UserID)
            ON DELETE CASCADE
)
Create Table Contributes (
      UserID INT,
      ItemID INT,
      Percentage FLOAT,
      PRIMARY KEY (UserID, ItemID),
      FOREIGN KEY (UserID)
            REFERENCES Accounts(UserID)
            ON DELETE CASCADE,
      FOREIGN KEY (ItemID)
            REFERENCES Items(ItemID)
            ON DELETE CASCADE
)
```

Code to connect to database

gcloud sql connect wynaut --user=root use Wynaut-Database

Screenshot of Implementation

3 databases of 1000 entries

```
mysql> Select Count(ItemID) From Items;
+-----+
| Count(ItemID) |
+-----+
| 1001 |
+-----+
1 row in set (0.01 sec)
```

Advanced query ideas

Amount each user pays for a given receipt (ReceiptId = 0 as an example)

Code

SELECT Contributes.UserId as UserId, SUM(Items.Price * Contributes.Percentage) as Paid FROM Contributes NATURAL JOIN Items

Where Items.ReceiptID = 0

GROUP BY Contributes. UserId;

Image

```
mysql> SELECT Contributes.UserId as UserId, SUM(Items.Price * Contributes.Percentage) as Paid
    -> FROM Contributes NATURAL JOIN Items
    -> Where Items.ReceiptID = 0
    -> GROUP BY Contributes.UserId
    -> LIMIT 15
| UserId | Paid
      15 | 0.09989999547824269
      87 | 1.798200030255316
65 | 5.794199700522427
     165 |
     314 | 1.9979999839961522
     690 | 0.29969998643472806
    166 | 3.9701999766
703 | 0.6616999955654137
     777 | 0.050900000388175215
     903 | 0.4072000031054017
      4 |
            0.899100015127658
     210 | 0.7991999638259415
     264 |
              6.893099818253518
     366 |
            0.6992999869555234
     455 | 0.19979999095648537
     955 | 0.49949999599903805
15 rows in set (0.01 sec)
```

<u>Indexing</u>

Before:

```
| -> Limit: 15 row(s) (actual time=0.186.0.189 rows=15 loops=1)
-> Table scan on <temporary> (actual time=0.185.0.186 rows=15 loops=1)
-> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=0.183.0.183 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=14.6 rows=34.8) (actual time=0.0636.0.155 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Index lookup on Items using Items_ibfk_1 (ReceiptID=0) (cost=2.45 rows=7) (actual time=0.0343..0.0357 rows=7 loops=1)
-> Index lookup on Contributes using Contributes_ibfk_2 (ItemID=Items.ItemID) (cost=1.32 rows=4.98) (actual time=0.0153..0.0163 rows=5 loops=7)
```

Index by Items.Price (No Change):

```
| -> Table scan on <temporary> (actual time=1.11..1.12 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=1.11..1.11 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=14.6 rows=34.8) (actual time=0.939..1.07 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Index lookup on Items using Items Lift 1 (ReciptID=0) (cost=2.45 rows=7) (actual time=0.875..0.877 rows=7 loops=1)
-> Index lookup on Contributes using Contributes_ibfk_2 (ItemID=Items.ItemID) (cost=1.32 rows=4.98) (actual time=0.0253..0.0263 rows=5 loops=7)
```

Index by Contributes.Percentage (No Change):

```
| -> Table scan on <temporary> (actual time=0.425..0.428 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=0.423..0.423 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=14.6 rows=34.8) (actual time=0.297..0.391 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Index lookup on Items using Items_ibfk 1 (ReceiptID=0) (cost=2.45 rows=7) (actual time=0.265..0.266 rows=7 loops=1)
-> Index lookup on Contributes using Contributes_ibfk_2 (ItemID=Items.ItemID) (cost=1.32 rows=4.98) (actual time=0.0158..0.0168 rows=5 loops=7)
```

Index by Items.ReceiptID (No Change):

```
| -> Table scan on <temporary> (actual time=0.476..0.564 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=0.475..0.475 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=14.6 rows=34.8) (actual time=0.219..0.431 rows=35 loops=1)
-> Index lookup on Items using index 3 (ReceiptID=0) (cost=2.45 rows=7) (actual time=0.11..0.113 rows=7 loops=1)
-> Index lookup on Contributes using Contributes_ibfk_2 (ItemID=Items.ItemID) (cost=1.32 rows=4.98) (actual time=0.0429..0.0445 rows=5 loops=7)
```

Justification

Indexing by Items.Price and Contributes.Percentage didn't make a difference probably due to the fact that these two attributes were used for calculations and not for querying the data. Calculations don't impact the cost of the query since only searching matters. Indexing by ReceiptID also didn't make a difference even though there was filtering involved using the WHERE clause. This is probably because ReceiptID was a foreign key that referenced the ReceiptID in the Receipts Table which is a primary key. This may have already created an index in which Items.ReceiptID used when filtering the data.

Average item cost for each categories for a certain user (UserId = 5 as an example) Code

EXPLAIN ANALYZE

Select Category, Avg(newPrice) as AverageItemCost

FROM (Select Category, (Price * Percentage) as newPrice

FROM Items NATURAL JOIN Contributes

WHERE UserID = 5) as price subquery

GROUP BY Category

Order by AverageItemCost desc;

<u>Image</u>

```
mysql> Select Category, Avg(newPrice) as AverageItemCost
    -> FROM (Select Category, (Price * Percentage) as newPrice
    -> FROM Items NATURAL JOIN Contributes
    -> WHERE UserID = 5) as price subquery
    -> GROUP BY Category
    -> Order by AverageItemCost desc;
 Category
                      AverageItemCost
| Healthcare
                     | 14.77227409773545
Housing
                       13.660849665673084
| Miscellaneous
                     | 6.812516826049364
                        5.058749877807375
| Transportation
| Taxes
                        3.387833255360524
Food
                       3.060899914009337
                   1.9933499495401978
 Utilities
| Education
                       1.599199945944548
  Household Supplies | 0.515266654895246
                     | 0.27989999145492916
  Insurance
10 rows in set (0.01 sec)
```

Our output is less than 15 rows because we divided items into 10 possible categories.

Before any indexing:

Indexing on Items.Category (No change):

Indexing on Items.Price (No change):

```
KEY 'index 1' ('Price'),
CONSTRAINT 'Items ibfk 1' FOREIGN KEY ('ReceiptID') REFERENCES 'Receipts' ('ReceiptID') ON DELETE CASCADR,
CONSTRAINT 'Items ibfk 2' FOREIGN KEY ('Category') REFERENCES 'Budget' ('Category') ON DELETE SET NULL

ENGINE-InnoDB DEFAULT CHARSET-wtf8mb4 COLLATE-wtf8mb4_0900_ai_ci |

1 row in set (0.01 sec)
mysql> EXFLAIN ANALYZE

-> Select Category, Avg(newPrice) as AverageItemCost
-> FROM (Select Category, [Frice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, [Frice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Frice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage) as newPrice
-> FROM (Select Category, Crice * Percentage)
-> Control of the Percentage of t
```

Indexing on Contributes.Percentage (No Change):

Justification

Indexes queried against Items.Category, Items.Price, and Contributes.Percentage did not show performance improvements since the query optimizer continued to maintain sequential scans with the same cost estimates of 16.9. I think that this lack of benefit is the consequence of three reasons: (1) The WHERE UserID = 5 limitation operated on Contributes.UserID, which was not indexed, which forced full table scans; (2) Natural join actually makes effective use of primary key indexes (ItemID), and no optimization slack remained for secondary indexes on non-key fields; (3) With only 10 categories, group operations were insignificantly overhead-independent with or without an index. While math functions like Price*Percentage in the subquery cannot be indexed directly, the index on Contributes.UserID would have theoretically improved filtering. Because the dataset scale is small and there already are primary key optimizations, the final recommendation for index design is to use the indexes that are actually required, as additional indices provided no noticeable enhancements to this specific query profile and dataset size.

List Users who have total spending under the avgExpense of their income bracket

Explain Analyze

Select UserID

From Accounts Natural Join AverageExpense Natural Join

(SELECT UserId, SUM(Items.Price * Contributes.Percentage) as totalPrice FROM

Contributes NATURAL JOIN Items GROUP BY UserId) Split

Where Split.totalPrice < avgExpense

Order By UserID

Limit 15;

Due to the data we have used, none of the users have spent more than the averageExpense of their tax bracket.

```
| A Sort: Accounts.DesrID (actual time=14..114 row=1000 logp=1)
| Sort: Accounts.DesrID (actual time=10..114 row=1000 logp=1)
| Sort: Accounts.DesrID (actual time=0..014..014 row=10..014 row=111 logp=10..014 row=1
```

Index Items.Price

```
### REPEALED

| Deficion of any Expension Order by UserID | Control of the Contro
```

Index Items.Price and Contributes.Percentage

Indexing avgExpense

```
Sprian Analyze Science (Serior Company) (Actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (Serior (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (Serior (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (Serior (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (Serior (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (Serior (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (Serior (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual Line-120.123 row-1000 loop=1)

- Sort: Accounts. (cost-2456 row-2) (actual
```

For the query that lists users who have total spending under the avgExpense of their income bracket, we decided to Index avgExpense. After indexing avgExpense, the cost went down a good amount. This is likely due to the fact that Split.totalPrice is being compared to avgExpense in the Where clause, making indexing avgExpense speed up the query. Indexing Items.Price did decrease the cost by a little but weirdly enough, it seems like indexing Contributes.Percentage didn't change the cost from just indexing Items.Price. Also, removing the indices does not revert the cost to the previous cost.

Receipts in a given year that contain only items bought by a group of users in which all users contribute:

Note: Should be given a temporary table of userIds. (38,50,296) used as userIDs and 2023 used as the year.

```
mysql> Select ReceiptID
    -> From
          (Select ReceiptID, Count(UserID) as totalUsers
    ->
          From Items Natural Join Contributes
    ->
          Where UserId in
    ->
              (Select UserID
    ->
    ->
              From Accounts
              Where UserID in (38,50,296))
    ->
    ->
    ->
              and
    ->
              ReceiptID not in
    ->
              (Select ReceiptID
    ->
              From Items Natural Join Contributes
    ->
    ->
              Where not UserId in
                  (Select UserID
    ->
                  From Accounts
    ->
    ->
                  Where UserID in (38,50,296)))
          Group by ReceiptID) as A
    ->
    ->
          Natural Join
    ->
    ->
   ->
          Receipts
   -> Where totalUsers =
          (Select Count(UserID)
    ->
    ->
          From Accounts
          Where UserID in (38,50,296))
    ->
    ->
    ->
          and
    ->
          PurchaseDate like "2023%"
    ->
   -> ;
ReceiptID
+----+
   227
+----+
1 row in set (0.01 sec)
```

Output is less than 15 because there only exists one receipt that only contains the users in the example where each user buys at least one item. Our data just makes it rare for this situation to happen but for actual use cases, it would be more common.

```
| Control | Cont
-> Select 86 (subquery in condition; run only once)
-> Select 86 (subquery in condition; run only once)
-> Aggregate: count(Accounts.UserID) (cost-2.56 rows-1) (actual time-0.09102.0.0183 rows-1 loops-1)
-> Filter: (Accounts.UserID) (a5.95.096) (cost-2.6 rows-3) (actual time-0.09305.0.00713 rows-2 loops-1)
-> Covering index range scan on Accounts using PRIMARY over (UserID = 38) 08 (UserID = 206) (cost-2.26 rows-3) (actual time-0.09306.0.00713 rows-2 loops-1)
-> Filter: (Recurs.Like Ible '2023') (cost-0.650 rows-6) (11) (actual time-0.0231.0.0922 rows-1 loops-1)
-> Single-row index lookup on Receipts using PRIMARY (ReceiptID A.ReceiptID) (cost-0.656 rows-1) (actual time-0.0211.0.0922 rows-1 loops-1)
```

Items.ReceiptID (Cost up)

Receipts.PurchaseDate (Cost Down)

```
ted loop inner join (cost-24.5 rows-1.66) (actual time-5.68.5.68 rows-1 loops-1)
iliter: (A.totallisers = (select #6)) and (A.ReceiptID is not mall)) (cost-1.29.19.3 rows-14.9) (actual time-5.66.5.66 rows-1 loops-1)

- Naterialize (cost-6.0 rows-0) (actual time-5.63.5.56 rows-1 loops-1)

- Naterialize (cost-6.0 rows-0) (actual time-5.63.5.56 rows-1 loops-1)

- Naterialize (cost-6.0 rows-0) (actual time-5.63.5.56 rows-1 loops-1)

- Naterialize (cost-6.0 rows-0) (actual time-5.61.5.56 rows-1 loops-1)

- Naterialize (cost-6.0 rows-0) (actual time-5.61.5.50 rows-1 loops-1)

- Naterialize (cost-6.0 rows-0) (actual time-6.0 rows-1 loops-1)

- Naterialize (actual time-6.
>> Covering index range scan on Accounts using PRIMARY over (UserID = 38) OR (UserID = 20) UN (UserID = 290) UN (UserID
```

Items.ReceiptID and Receipts.PurchaseDate (Cost Down but less)

```
> Patted loop inner join (cott-24.5 rows-1.66) (actual time-4.01.4.61 rows-1.00px-1)
> Filter: (fictotalburss : celebra #8) and (a Receignt #10) and (a Rece
```

Justification:

In my query, the main attributes that are used are ReceiptID, PurchaseDate, and UserID. We are testing indexing on the first two as the UserID is already a primary. Receipts.PurchaseDate decreased the cost as it makes it easier to find the year. Items.ReceiptID isn't directly used for searching so in theory, it shouldn't heavily affect the cost. The cost increased slightly possibly due to some other underlying reason such as memory or storage, the real reason is unclear at the moment. The indexing on both acts as expected, decreasing the cost overall due to ReceiptID but increasing slightly from PurchaseDate.