

SWEN304: Normal Forms

Dr. Dionysios Athanasopoulos

Lecturer

`dionysios.athanasopoulos@vuw.ac.nz`

Office: EA111, Easterfield building, Kelburn Campus

Agenda

- 1 Background - Terminology
- 2 Normal Forms

Functional Dependency (FD)

Given a relation schema $R(A, F)$, where $A = \{..., X, Y, ...\}$ is a set of attributes and F is a set of FDs,

- FD denoted by $X \rightarrow Y$, is that, for any two tuples t_1 and t_2 in R that have $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$, they must also have $t_1[Y] = t_2[Y]$.

Relation schema: Grade

student_id	course_id	student_name	grade
1000	SWEN304	Joe M.	A+
1000	SWEN222	Joe M.	A-

Functional dependency:

- $student_id \rightarrow student_name$

Primary Key

- If there cannot be more than one tuple of relation schema with the same value for a subset X of attributes, then X is the **primary key** of the relation schema:
 - $X \rightarrow Y$ for any subset Y of the attributes of the relation schema.

Relation schema: Grade

<u>student_id</u>	<u>course_id</u>	student_name	grade
1000	SWEN304	Joe M.	A+
1000	SWEN222	Joe M.	A-

Functional dependencies:

- $student_id + course_id \rightarrow student_name$
- $student_id + course_id \rightarrow grade$
- $student_id + course_id \rightarrow student_name + grade$

Terminology

Candidate key

- If a relation schema has more than one keys, then each one of them is a **candidate key**.

Prime attribute

- An attribute of relation schema is called **prime attribute** if it is a member of a candidate key.

Superkey

- Any set of attributes that includes not only a primary key but also extra attributes is called **superkey**;
 - in contrast to a superkey, a key has to be **minimal**; i.e. if an attribute is removed from a key, then it is not a key.

Algorithm for Determining a Key of a Relation Schema

Input: R, F

Output: K

- 1: $K \leftarrow R$
- 2: **for all** attributes A in K **do**
- 3: **compute** the closure $(K - A)^+$ w.r.t. F
- 4: **if** $(K - A)^+$ contains all the attributes in R **then**
- 5: $K \leftarrow K - \{A\}$

Relation schema: Faculty R

StudID	StudName	Pts	CourID	CourName	LectID	LectName	Grade
--------	----------	-----	--------	----------	--------	----------	-------

Functional dependencies:

- $F = \{StudID \rightarrow StudName + Pts, CourID \rightarrow CourName, LectID \rightarrow LectName + CourID, StudID + CourID \rightarrow Grade + LectID\}$

1st step of the algorithm for determining a key:

- $K = \{StudID, StudName, Pts, CourID, CourName, LectID, LectName, Grade\}$

Algorithm for Determining the Closure of Attributes

2nd - 5th steps of the algorithm for determining a key:

- $(K - A)^+ = ??$
- e.g. $(K - StudID)^+ = ??$

```
1: function CALCULATECLOSURE( $K, F$ ):  $K^+$ 
2:    $K^+ \leftarrow K$ 
3:   repeat
4:      $oldK^+ \leftarrow K^+$ 
5:     for all  $Y \rightarrow Z$  do
6:       if  $K^+ \supseteq Y$  then
7:          $K^+ \leftarrow K^+ \cup Z$ 
8:   until  $oldK^+ = K^+$ 
9: end function
```

2nd - 5th steps of the algorithm for determining a key:

- $(K - StudID)^+ = \{StudName, Pts, CourID, CourName, LectID, LectName, Grade\}$ **does not contain** all the attributes in R
 - $K = \{StudID, StudName, Pts, CourID, CourName, LectID, LectName, Grade\}$ ($StudID$ is **not removed** from the K)

Algorithm for Determining a Key of a Relation

2nd - 5th steps of the algorithm for determining a key:

- $(K - \text{StudName})^+ = \{\text{StudID}, \text{StudName}, \text{Pts}, \text{CourID}, \text{CourName}, \text{LectID}, \text{LectName}, \text{Grade}\}$ **contains** all the attributes in R
 - $K = \{\text{StudID}, \text{Pts}, \text{CourID}, \text{CourName}, \text{LectID}, \text{LectName}, \text{Grade}\}$
(StudName is **removed** from the K)
- $(K - \text{Pts})^+ = \{\text{StudID}, \text{StudName}, \text{Pts}, \text{CourID}, \text{CourName}, \text{LectID}, \text{LectName}, \text{Grade}\}$ **contains** all the attributes in R
 - $K = \{\text{StudID}, \text{CourID}, \text{CourName}, \text{LectID}, \text{LectName}, \text{Grade}\}$
(Pts is **removed** from the K)
- $(K - \text{CourName})^+ = \{\text{StudID}, \text{StudName}, \text{Pts}, \text{CourID}, \text{CourName}, \text{LectID}, \text{LectName}, \text{Grade}\}$ **contains** all the attributes in R
 - $K = \{\text{StudID}, \text{CourID}, \text{LectID}, \text{LectName}, \text{Grade}\}$
(CourName is **removed** from the K)

Algorithm for Determining a Key of a Relation

- $(K - CourID)^+ = \{StudID, StudName, Pts, LectID, LectName, Grade\}$
does not contain all the attributes in R
 - $K = \{StudID, CourID, LectID, LectName, Grade\}$
($CourID$ is **not removed** from the K)
- $(K - LectName)^+ = \{StudID, StudName, Pts, CourID, CourName, LectID, LectName, Grade\}$ **contains** all the attributes in R
 - $K = \{StudID, CourID, LectID, Grade\}$
($LectName$ is **removed** from the K)
- $(K - LectID)^+ = \{StudID, StudName, Pts, CourID, CourName, LectID, LectName, Grade\}$ **contains** all the attributes in R (transitivity rule)
 - $K = \{StudID, CourID, Grade\}$
($LectID$ is **removed** from the K)
- $(K - Grade)^+ = \{StudID, StudName, Pts, CourID, CourName, LectID, LectName, Grade\}$ **contains** all the attributes in R
 - $K = \{StudID, CourID\}$
($Grade$ is **removed** from the K)

Primary key: $K = \{StudID, CourID\}$

Candidate Keys & Inference Rules

Candidate keys can be **inferred** via changing the order that the attributes are examined.

- e.g. candidate keys for the relation *Faculty* are:
 - $K = \{StudID, CourID\}$ (concluded to it in the previous slides)
 - $K = \{StudID, LectID\}$

Inference rules for determining keys:

- (Reflexivity) $Y \subseteq X \models X \rightarrow Y$ (trivial FD)
- (Augmentation) $X \rightarrow Y \wedge Z \supseteq W \models XZ \rightarrow YW$ (partial FD)
- (Transitivity) $X \rightarrow Y \wedge Y \rightarrow Z \models X \rightarrow Z$ (transitive FD)
- (Pseudo transitivity) $X \rightarrow Y \wedge WY \rightarrow Z \models WX \rightarrow Z$
- (Decomposition) $X \rightarrow YZ \models X \rightarrow Y \wedge X \rightarrow Z$
- (Union) $X \rightarrow Y \wedge X \rightarrow Z \models X \rightarrow YZ$

Exercises on Candidate Keys

Relation schema: Exercise 1

C	Z	S
---	---	---

Functional dependencies:

- $\{Z \rightarrow C, CS \rightarrow Z\}$

Determine all the candidate keys.

Relation schema: Exercise 2

A	B	C	D
---	---	---	---

Functional dependencies:

- $\{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow C, CD \rightarrow A, AC \rightarrow D\}$

Determine all the candidate keys.

Agenda

1 Background - Terminology

2 Normal Forms

Normalization

- Normalization is a process of analyzing relation schemas based on **normal form tests** to minimize:
 - redundancy
 - insertion, deletion, and update anomalies.
- Relation schemas that do not meet the normal form tests are **decomposed** into smaller relation schemas.

Normal form tests:

- 1 Functional dependencies
 - First Normal Form (1NF), Second Normal Form (2NF), Third Normal Form (3NF), and Boyce-Codd Normal Form (BCNF)
- 2 Multi-valued and join dependencies
 - Fourth Normal Form (4NF) and Fifth Normal Form (5NF).

First Normal Form

1NF

- It is part of the formal definition of a **flat** relation schema;
- it disallows **nested relation schemas**.

Relation schema: Student (**nested relation schema**)

<u>id</u>	name	address	school	year
1000	Joe M.	Kelburn	ECS SMS	2005 2010

First Normal Form (1NF)

To achieve 1NF for such a relation schema:

- **Unnest relation schemas:** remove the nested relation attributes into a new relation schema and propagate the primary key into it;

Relation schema: Student

<u>id</u>	name	address
1000	Joe M.	Kelburn

Relation schema: School

<u>id</u>	school	year
1000	ECS	2005
1000	SMS	2010

First Normal Form

1NF

- It is part of the formal definition of a **flat** relation schema;
- it disallows **nested relation schemas**;
- it disallows **multivalued attributes**.

Relation schema: Student (**multivalued attribute**)

<u>id</u>	name	address	school
1000	Joe M.	Kelburn	{ ECS, SMS }

First Normal Form (1NF)

There are two ways to achieve 1NF for such a relation schema:

- 1 **Place the multi-valued attribute in a separate relation schema,** along with the primary key.

Relation schema: Student

<u>id</u>	name	address
1000	Joe M.	Kelburn

Relation schema: School

<u>id</u>	<u>school</u>
1000	ECS
1000	SMS

First Normal Form (1NF)

There are two ways to achieve 1NF for such a relation schema:

- 1 Place the multivalued attribute in a separate relation schema, along with the primary key;
- 2 **Expand the key** so that there will be a separate tuple for value of the problematic attribute;
 - it introduces **redundancy**.

Relation schema: Student

<u>id</u>	<u>name</u>	<u>address</u>	<u>school</u>
1000	Joe M.	Kelburn	ECS
1000	Joe M.	Kelburn	SMS

First Normal Form (1NF)

- Redundancy leads to **update** anomalies.

Relation schema: Student

<u>id</u>	name	address	<u>school</u>
1000	Joe M.	Kelburn	ECS
1000	Joe M.	Kelburn	SMS

- If we would correct a mistake in a student `name`, then we have to update every row that is related to a student.

Second Normal Form

2NF

- It disallows **partial functional dependencies**;
 - $X \rightarrow Y$ is a full functional dependency if removal of any attribute from the set X means that the dependency does not hold any more.
- In other words, if primary key contains multiple attributes, **no non-key attribute should not be functionally dependent on a part of the primary key**.

Relation schema: Grade (partial functional dependency)

<u>student_id</u>	<u>course_id</u>	student_name	grade
1000	SWEN304	Joe M.	A+
1000	SWEN222	Joe M.	A-

Partial functional dependency:

- $student_id \rightarrow student_name$

Second Normal Form (2NF)

To achieve 2NF for such a relation schema:

- **Decompose and set up a new relation schema** for each partial key with its dependent attribute(s).

Relation schema: Grade 1

<u>student_id</u>	<u>course_id</u>	grade
1000	SWEN304	A+
1000	SWEN222	A-

Relation schema: Grade 2

<u>student_id</u>	student_name
1000	Joe M.

2NF Exercise 1

Relation schema: Student

<u>StudID</u>	<u>CourID</u>	StudName	NoOfPts	Grade
---------------	---------------	----------	---------	-------

Functional dependencies:

- $StudID \rightarrow StudName + NoOfPts$
- $StudID + CourID \rightarrow Grade$

Observation: if the `Grade` attribute cannot have `null` values, a new student cannot be inserted until s/he passes a new exam.

In what normal form is the above relation schema?

Make the proper decompositions in order to bring the relation schema in 2NF.

2NF Exercise 2

Relation schema: Faculty

<u>LectID</u>	LectName	<u>CourID</u>	CourName
---------------	----------	---------------	----------

Functional dependencies:

- $LectID \rightarrow LectName$
- $LectID \rightarrow CourID$
- $LectID \rightarrow CourName$
- $CourID \rightarrow CourName$

Observation: new `Course` data cannot be inserted without knowing who is going to lecture it. Moreover, if a `Lecturer` resigns, `Course` data will be lost.

In what normal form is the above relation schema?

Make the proper decompositions in order to bring the relation schema in 2NF.

Third Normal Form

3NF

- It disallows **transitive dependencies**;
 - $X \rightarrow Y$ is a transitive dependency if there exists a set of attributes Z that is neither a candidate key nor a subset of a primary key and both $X \rightarrow Z$ and $Z \rightarrow Y$ hold.
- In other words, **a nonkey attribute should not be functionally dependent by another nonkey attribute.**

Relation schema: Lecturer (transitive dependency)

<u>lecturer_id</u>	lecturer_name	university_shortcut	university_name
L1000	Jack A.	VUW	Victoria University of Wellington
L1001	Chris M.	UOA	University of Auckland

Part of the transitive functional dependency:

- *university_shortcut* \rightarrow *university_name*

Third Normal Form (3NF)

To achieve 3NF for such a relation schema:

- **decompose and set up a new relation schema** that includes the nonkey attribute(s) that functionally determine(s) other nonkey attribute(s).

Relation schema: Lecturer

<u>lecturer_id</u>	lecturer_name	university_shortcode
L1000	Jack A.	VUW
L1001	Chris M.	UOA

Relation schema: University

<u>university_shortcode</u>	university_name
VUW	Victoria University of Wellington
UOA	University of Auckland

3NF Exercise

Relation schema: Faculty

<u>LectID</u>	LectName	CourID	CourName
---------------	----------	--------	----------

Functional dependencies:

- $LectID \rightarrow LectName$
- $LectID \rightarrow CourID$
- $LectID \rightarrow CourName$
- $CourID \rightarrow CourName$

In what normal form is the above relation schema?

Make the proper decompositions in order to bring the relation schema in 3NF.

Boyce-Codd Normal Form (BCNF)

BCNF

- Whenever a nontrivial functional dependency $X \rightarrow Y$ holds in a relation schema, X is a **superkey** of the relation schema.

Trivial functional dependency:

- if $X \rightarrow Y$ holds and $Y \subseteq X$, then it is a trivial functional dependency.

Relation schema: Example

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
----------	----------	----------

Functional dependencies:

- $A + B \rightarrow C$
- $C \rightarrow B$

BCNF Example

Relation schema: Teach

<u>student_id</u>	<u>course_id</u>	lecturer_name
-------------------	------------------	---------------

Functional dependencies:

- $student_id + course_id \rightarrow lecturer_name$
- $lecturer_name \rightarrow course_id^1$

In what normal form is the above relation schema?

Make the proper decompositions to bring the relation schema in BCNF.

¹ Assuming that each lecturer teaches only one course.

BCNF Example

To achieve BCNF for such a relation schema:

- **decompose and set up a new relation schema** that includes the attributes of the problematic dependency.
- (lecturer_name, course_id) and (lecturer_name, student_id)

Observations:

- all the decompositions **lose** the first functional dependency:
student_id + course_id → lecturer_name
- the decomposition does not generate spurious tuples after a join (i.e. additional tuples that were not present in the original relation schema).

BCNF Exercise

Relation schema: Faculty

<u>LectID</u>	<u>StudID</u>	<u>CourID</u>	Grade
---------------	---------------	---------------	-------

Functional dependencies:

- $\{LectID \rightarrow CourID, StudID + CourID \rightarrow LectID, StudID + CourID \rightarrow Grade\}$

Observations:

- If a lecturer resigns and we delete a tuple, we will lose information about student enrollments.
- If a lecturer wants to start teaching a new course and we insert a tuple with the same lecturer and a different course, the functional dependency $LectID \rightarrow CourID$ will be violated.

In what normal form is the above relation schema?

Make the proper decompositions to bring the relation schema in BCNF.

Conclusions in 1NF, 2NF, 3NF, and BCNF

- Only the first four normal forms are practically used
- 1NF, 2NF, and (partly) 3NF **suffer from** update anomalies
- BCNF relations are (practically) **free** of update anomalies
 - it represents a possible goal of normalization
 - however, it possibly loses functional dependencies.

Normal Form of a Set of Relation Schemas

- The normal form of a set of relation schemas is the normal form of the relation schema being in the lowest normal form.

Relation schema: R_1

A	B
---	---

Relation schema: R_2

B	C	D	E
---	---	---	---

Functional dependencies:

- $\{A \rightarrow B, BC \rightarrow D, C \rightarrow E\}$

Due to R_2 , the whole set is in 1NF, even though R_1 is in BCNF.

- ElMasri, Navathe, Fundamentals of Database Systems, 6th Edition, Addison Wesley.
- Hui Ma & Pavle Mogin, SWEN304 Lecture Slides, 2016
https://ecs.victoria.ac.nz/Courses/SWEN304_2016T2/LectureSchedule