

Problem 2:

- a. Candidate Key: {AE}
- b. Canonical cover: $F_c = \{E \rightarrow BG, A \rightarrow BCDFG\}$
- c. It is not in BCNF because there is nontrivial functional dependency $CD \rightarrow F$, and CD is not a superkey.

Decomposing relation R into BCNF:

Because $E \rightarrow BG$ and E is not a superkey: $R_1 = \{E, B, G\}$ and $R_2 = \{ACDEF\}$.

Because $A \rightarrow CDF$ and A is not a superkey, decomposing relation R2 into BCNF:

$R_2 = \{A, C, D, F\}$ and $R_3 = \{A, E\}$.

Thus the BCNF form is: $R_1 = \{E, B, G\}$, $R_2 = \{A, C, D, F\}$ and $R_3 = \{A, E\}$.

- d. No. The BCNF form in (c) is not dependency preserving. We cannot check $A \rightarrow BG$ in the result of (c).
3NF form: $R_1 = \{E, B, G\}$, $R_2 = \{A, B, C, D, F, G\}$, $R_3 = \{A, E\}$.

Problem 3:

- a. This is not a good design for following reasons:
 - 1) Current schema does not reflect a lot of functional dependencies. For instance, as per assumptions in the question, $\{cid \rightarrow cname, email, phone\}$ holds, but since the $\{cid\}$ is not a candidate key, we will end up repeating this information in several tuples.
 - 2) Inserting values for the separate entities in one table like customer or theater will lead to storing NULL and duplicate values at several places. This will increase the storage and our data will be inconsistent.
 - 3) We have to access this one table for querying even minimal data, for instance, information for one single customer, this will be time consuming as everything $\{theater, ticket\}$ is under this table.
 - 4) Lastly, this schema does not adhere to the normalization rules. As everything is stored in one table, it will make maintenance and querying from the database difficult and it will be hard to see relation between each attribute. The relational database system works better with several small tables than a big table.
- b. Following are all non-trivial functional dependencies:

It is assumed here that the input value of discount would be 1 if there is no discount.

$\{cid\} \rightarrow \{cname, email, phone\}$
 $\{tid\} \rightarrow \{tname, address\}$
 $\{tid, screennum\} \rightarrow \{capacity\}$
 $\{tid, sucreennum, mtime\} \rightarrow \{mid, mname, mtype, mgenre\}$
 $\{mid\} \rightarrow \{mname, mtype, mgenre\}$
 $\{cid, tid, sucreennum, mtime, ticketnum\} \rightarrow \{price, discount\}$

c. Candidate Keys: $\{cid, tid, mid, mtime, screennum, ticketnum\}$

d. The canonical cover for the functional dependencies in F is:

$\{cid\} \rightarrow \{cname, email, phone\}$
 $\{tid\} \rightarrow \{tname, address\}$
 $\{tid, screennum\} \rightarrow \{capacity\}$
 $\{tid, sucreennum, mtime\} \rightarrow \{mid\}$
 $\{mid\} \rightarrow \{mname, mtype, mgenre\}$
 $\{cid, tid, sucreennum, mtime, ticketnum\} \rightarrow \{price, discount\}$

e. No, it is not in BCNF. Because for schema to be BCNF for each non-trivial dependency $A \rightarrow B$, A should be a superkey, which is not the case here.

Convert into BCNF form:

Step 1: Relation TicketInformation can be decomposed into CUSTOMER and R2 according to the violation by dependency $\{cid\} \rightarrow \{cname, email, phone\}$, we can get relation Customer:

Customer (cid, cname, email, phone)

R2 = {cid, tid, tname, address, mid, mname, mtype, mgenre, mtime, screennum, capacity, ticketnum, price, discount}

Step 2: According to the violation by functional dependency $\{tid\} \rightarrow \{tname, address\}$, We can get relation Theater:

Theater (tid, tname, address)

R3 = {cid, tid, mid, mname, mtype, mgenre, mtime, screennum, capacity, ticketnum, price, discount}

Step 3: According to the violation by functional dependency $\{tid, screennum\} \rightarrow \{capacity\}$, We can get relation Capacity:

Capacity(tid, screennum, capacity)

R4 = {cid, tid, mid, mname, mtype, mgenre, mtime, screennum, ticketnum, price, discount}

Step4: According to the violation by functional dependency $\{tid, sucreennum, mtime\} \rightarrow \{mid\}$, We can get Showing:

Showing (tid, sucreennum, mtime, mid)

R5 = {cid, tid, mid, mname, mtype, mgenre, mtime, screennum, ticketnum, price, discount}

Step 5: According to the violation by functional dependency $\{mid\} \rightarrow \{mname, mtype, mgenre\}$, we can get relation Movie:

Movie (mid, mname, mtype, mgenre)

R6 = {cid, tid, mid, mtime, screennum, ticketnum, price, discount}

Step 6: According to the violation by functional dependency $\{cid, tid, sucreennum, mtime, ticketnum\} \rightarrow \{price, discount\}$, we can get relation Ticket:

Ticket (cid, tid, sucreennum, mtime, ticketnum, price, discount)

R7 = {cid, tid, mid, mtime, screennum, ticketnum}

Thus, the BCNF form is:

Customer (cid, cname, email, phone)

Theater(tid, tname, taddress)

Capacity (tid, screennum, capacity)

Showing (tid, sucreennum, mtime, mid)

Movie (mid, mname, mtype, mgenre)

Ticket (cid, tid, sucreennum, mtime, ticketnum, price, discount)

TicketInformation (cid, tid, mid, mtime, screennum, ticketnum)

f. Yes, the schema in section e is dependency preserving because each relation carries one of the relationships in canonical cover.

g. If we add an additional constraint ---

b. non-trivial functional dependencies:

$\{cid\} \rightarrow \{cname, email, phone\}$

$\{tid\} \rightarrow \{tname, taddress\}$

$\{tid, screennum\} \rightarrow \{capacity\}$

$\{tid, sucreennum, mtime\} \rightarrow \{mid, mname, mtype, mgenre\}$

$\{mid\} \rightarrow \{mname, mtype, mgenre\}$

$\{cid, tid, sucreennum, mtime, ticketnum\} \rightarrow \{price, discount\}$

$\{tid, sucreennum, mtime\} \rightarrow \{price\}$

c. candidate keys: {cid, tid, mid, mtime, screennum, ticketnum}

d. canonical cover:

$\{cid\} \rightarrow \{cname, email, phone\}$
 $\{tid\} \rightarrow \{tname, taddress\}$
 $\{tid, screennum\} \rightarrow \{capacity\}$
 $\{tid, sucreennum, mtime\} \rightarrow \{mid\}$
 $\{mid\} \rightarrow \{mname, mtype, mgenre\}$
 $\{cid, tid, sucreennum, mtime, ticketnum\} \rightarrow \{price, discount\}$
 $\{tid, sucreennum, mtime\} \rightarrow \{price\}$

e. No, it is not in BCNF.

Decomposition (BCNF form):

Customer (cid, cname, email, phone)
 Theater (tid, tname, taddress)
 Capacity (tid, screennum, capacity)
 Showing (tid, sucreennum, mtime, mid)
 Movie (mid, mname, mtype, mgenre)
 Ticket (cid, tid, sucreennum, mtime, ticketnum, price, discount)
 TicketPrice (tid, sucreennum, mtime, price)
 TicketInformation (cid, tid, mid, mtime, screennum, ticketnum)

f. No, the schema in e. is not dependency preserving because the functional dependency $\{date, mgenre\} \rightarrow \{discount\}$ cannot be checked in the BCNF form. Thus, the 3NF form is:

Customer (cid, cname, email, phone)
 Theater (tid, tname, taddress)
 Capacity (tid, screennum, capacity)
 Showing (tid, sucreennum, mtime, mid)
 Movie (mid, mname, mtype, mgenre)
 Ticket (cid, tid, sucreennum, mtime, ticketnum, price)
 Discount (date, mgenre, discount)
 TicketInformation (cid, tid, mid, date, time, screennum, ticketnum)

Problem 4:

Using MySQL

a.

library x HW3_Q4 x

Limit to 1000 rows

```

1 SELECT table_name, count(column_name) as numattributes
2 FROM information_schema.columns natural join information_schema.tables
3 WHERE TABLE_SCHEMA = 'library'
4 GROUP BY TABLE_NAME;

```

100% 22:4

Result Grid Filter Rows: Search Export:

table_name	numattribut...
Book	5
BookCopy	2
CheckedOut	5
Member	4

b.

library x HW3_Q4 x

Limit to 1000 rows

```

5
6
7
8 #b)
9
10 CREATE TABLE temp AS
11 SELECT table_name as tname, count(column_name) as dtattribute
12 FROM information_schema.columns natural join information_schema.tables
13 WHERE table_schema = 'library'
14 AND DATA_TYPE = 'datetime'
15 GROUP BY tname;
16
17 SELECT tname
18 FROM temp
19 WHERE dtattribute > 1;
20
21

```

100% 1:20

Result Grid Filter Rows: Search Export:

tname
CheckedOut

Result Grid

c.

