Database Implementation

Database Implementation on GCP

Connecting to GCP:

```
gcloud sql connect sp24-db-team065 --user=root;
show databases;
use AccommoSeek;
show tables;
```

crime_statistics, hotel_review, living_wage tables are used as temporary tables to clean and export data into City and Review table.

Data Definition Language:

```
CREATE TABLE City (
 Name VARCHAR(255) PRIMARY KEY,
 State VARCHAR(255),
 LivingWage REAL,
 Population INT,
 CrimeFrequency REAL
CREATE TABLE Hotel (
 Name VARCHAR(255),
 Address VARCHAR(255),
 CityName VARCHAR(255),
 PRIMARY KEY (Name, CityName),
 FOREIGN KEY (CityName) REFERENCES City(Name)
);
CREATE TABLE Review (
UserName VARCHAR(255),
 Title VARCHAR(255),
 Text VARCHAR(1024),
 Rating REAL,
 Date datetime,
 HotelName VARCHAR(255),
 CityName VARCHAR(255),
 PRIMARY KEY (UserName, HotelName, CityName),
 FOREIGN KEY (HotelName) REFERENCES Hotel(Name),
 FOREIGN KEY (CityName) REFERENCES City(Name)
);
CREATE TABLE Temperature (
 Month INT,
 Year INT,
 Temperature REAL,
 CityName VARCHAR(255),
 PRIMARY KEY (Month, Year, CityName),
 FOREIGN KEY (CityName) REFERENCES City(Name)
);
CREATE TABLE Precipitation(
 CityState VARCHAR(255),
 Month INT,
 Precipitation REAL,
 PRIMARY KEY (CityState, Month),
 FOREIGN KEY (CityState) REFERENCES City(State)
);
```

Inserting Data

Advanced Queries

Advanced Query 1

Advanced features: join multiple relations, aggregation via GROUP BY, subqueries SELECT

```
c.Name AS CityName,
ROUND(AVG(t.Temperature), 2) AS AverageTemperature,
ROUND(AVG(c.LivingWage), 2) AS AverageLivingWage,
ROUND(AVG(c.CrimeRate), 2) AS AverageCrimeRate,
ROUND(AVG(r.Rating), 2) AS AverageRating
FROM City c
JOIN Temperature t ON c.Name = t.CityName
JOIN Hotel h ON c.Name = h.CityName
JOIN Review r ON h.Name = r.HotelName
GROUP BY c.Name
```

ROUP BY C.Name

HAVING

AVG(t.Temperature) > (SELECT AVG(Temperature) FROM Temperature)
AND AVG(r.Rating) > (SELECT AVG(Rating) FROM Review)
ORDER BY AverageRating DESC;

Top 15 results:

The output of the result has only 6 rows

Command:

Analysis before indexing:

Attempt 1: Index on Temperature

```
| -> Sort: AverageRating DESC (actual time=2269.986..2269.987 rows=6 loops=1)
| -> Filter: ((avg(t.Temperature) > (select #2)) and (avg(r.Rating) > (select #3))) (actual time=2269.947..2269.959 rows=6 loops=1)
| -> Nagregate using temporary table (actual time=2265.697.2265.697 rows=28 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=15151.34 rows=28624) (actual time=0.290..1117.020 rows=229700 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=5132.90 rows=5624) (actual time=0.290..1117.020 rows=21200 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=3139.25 rows=3100) (actual time=0.181..30.232 rows=3100 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=1399.25 rows=3100) (actual time=0.181..30.232 rows=3100 loops=1)
| -> Covering index scan on t using idx_temperature (cost=314.25 rows=1)00) (actual time=0.123..3.926 rows=310
| loops=1)
| -> Single-row index lookup on c using PRIMARY (Name=t.CityName) (cost=0.25 rows=1) (actual time=0.008..0.008 rows=1 loops=3100)
| -> Covering index lookup on h using idx_hotel_cityname (CityName=t.CityName) (cost=1.02 rows=2) (actual time=0.0 6..0.012 rows=7 loops=3100)
| -> Index lookup on r using HotelName (HotelName+h. Name*) (cost=1.27 rows=5) (actual time=0.018..0.048 rows=11 loops=1)
| -> Select #2 (subquery in condition; run only once)
| -> Aggregate: avg(Temperature. Temperature using idx_temperature (cost=314.25 rows=3100) (actual time=0.036..0.640 rows=3100 loops=1)
| -> Select #3 (subquery in condition; run only once)
| -> Aggregate: avg(Review.Rating) (cost=1802.75 rows=1) (actual time=0.3348..3,349 rows=1 loops=1)
| -> Table scan on Review (cost=953.75 rows=8490) (actual time=0.023..2.750 rows=8492 loops=1)
```

We expected to improve performance by indexing attributes in the HAVING clause, like 'Temperature'. The rationale behind this approach is that indexing should narrow down the search space to only include records meeting the specified condition, thereby improving efficiency. However, we've not seen a reduction in query costs. Specifically, even as the scan on 'Temperature' shifts from a table scan to an index scan, the cost remains static at 314.25. We suspect the reason is that our table's size is insufficient to exhibit significant improvements when weighed against the overhead of indexing in RDBMS.

Attempt 2: Index on CrimeRate

```
| -> Sort: AverageRating DESC (actual time=921.621..921.622 rows=6 loops=1)
| -> Filter: ((avg(t.Temperature) > (select #2)) and (avg(r.Rating) > (select #3))) (actual time=921.585..921.596 rows=6 loops=1)
| -> Table scan on <temporary (actual time=917.378..917.390 rows=28 loops=1)
| -> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=917.375..917.375 rows=28 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=15151.34 rows=28624) (actual time=0.142..735.310 rows=229700 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=5132.90 rows=5624) (actual time=0.082..45.208 rows=21200 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=1399.25 rows=3100) (actual time=0.070..19.551 rows=3100 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=13199.25 rows=3100) (actual time=0.070..19.551 rows=3100 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=1314.25 rows=3100) (actual time=0.049..2.636 rows=3100 loops=1)
| -> Single-row index lookup on c using PRIMARY (Name=t.CityName) (cost=0.25 rows=1) (actual time=0.005..0.005 rows=1 loops=3100)
| -> Covering index lookup on h using idx_hotel_cityname (CityName=t.CityName) (cost=1.02 rows=2) (actual time=0.04..0.008 rows=7 loops=3100)
| -> Index lookup on r using HotelName (HotelName=h.`Name`) (cost=1.27 rows=5) (actual time=0.013..0.032 rows=11 loops=1)
| -> Aggregate: avg(Temperature.Temperature) (cost=624.25 rows=1) (actual time=0.099..0.909 rows=1 loops=1)
| -> Aggregate: avg(Temperature.Temperature) (cost=624.25 rows=1) (actual time=0.036..0.721 rows=3100 loops=1)
| -> Pable scan on Temperature (cost=314.25 rows=3100) (actual time=0.036..0.721 rows=3100 loops=1)
| -> Table scan on Review (cost=953.75 rows=8490) (actual time=0.024..2.719 rows=8492 loops=1)
| -> Table scan on Review (cost=953.75 rows=8490) (actual time=0.024..2.719 rows=8492 loops=1)
```

The addition of an index on the attribute present in the SELECT clause, specifically 'CrimeRate,' was not expected to influence the cost. The outcomes of our analysis align with these expectations, confirming that the index has no impact on query cost.

Attempt 3: Index on Temperature and Rating

Likewise, we anticipate enhancing performance by adding an index to attributes present in the HAVING clause, such as the attribute 'Temperature' and 'Rating' in this context. However, we have not observed a reduction in query cost. Similarly, we believe that the size of our table may not be substantial enough to exhibit significant improvements.

Advanced Query 2

```
Advanced features: join multiple relations, aggregation via GROUP BY
SELECT
Hotel.Name,
Hotel.CityName,
Address,
ROUND(AVG(Rating), 2) AS Rating
FROM Hotel
JOIN Review ON Hotel.Name = Review.HotelName AND Hotel.CityName =
Review.CityName WHERE YEAR(Date) > 2015
GROUP BY
Hotel.Name,
Hotel.CityName
HAVING Rating > 3
ORDER BY Rating DESC
LIMIT 15;
```

Top 15 results:

Command:

```
mysql> Explain Analyze (SELECT
         Hotel.Name,
Hotel.CityName,
         Address,
         ROUND (
           AVG(Rating),
        ) AS Rating
    -> FROM
       Hotel
        JOIN Review ON Hotel.Name = Review.HotelName
        AND Hotel.CityName = Review.CityName
    -> WHERE
       YEAR(Date) > 2015
   -> GROUP BY
-> Hotel.Name,
        Hotel.CityName
    -> HAVING
        Rating > 3
    -> ORDER BY
       Rating DESC
    -> LIMIT
```

Analysis before indexing:

Attempt 1: Index on Review.Rating

Likewise, we anticipate enhancing performance by adding an index to attributes present in the HAVING clause, such as the attribute 'Rating' in this context. However, we have not observed a reduction in query cost. Similarly, we believe that the size of our table may not be substantial enough to exhibit significant improvements.

Attempt 2: Index on Review.Date

Similarly, we expected to boost performance by indexing attributes mentioned in the WHERE clause, like 'Date'. The logic behind this strategy mirrors that of indexing attributes in the HAVING clause. Despite these efforts, there has been no noticeable reduction in query costs. Once again, it appears that the relatively small size of our table may not allow for the significant improvements we anticipated.

Attempt 3: Composite index on Review.Rating & Review.Date

Creating a composite index on 'Rating' and 'Date' has yielded the same results as previously observed.

Advanced Query 3

Advanced features: join multiple relations, subqueries

SELECT

H.name,

H.cityName,

H.Address,

C.LivingWage,

C.CrimeRate

From Hotel H

JOIN (SELECT * FROM City WHERE LivingWage < (SELECT AVG(LivingWage) FROM City)

AND CrimeRate < (SELECT AVG(CrimeRate) FROM City)) C ON H.CityName = C.Name;

Top 15 results:

name	cityName	Address	LivingWage	CrimeRate
Best Western Plus-prairie Inn	Albany	1100 Price Rd Se	26.484166666666667	1332.7999892234802
Ramada Plaza Albany	Albany	3 Watervliet Ave. Ext.	26.48416666666667	1332.7999892234802
Holiday Inn Express Alpharetta - Roswell	Alpharetta	2950 Mansell Rd	26.484166666666667	399.6000053882599
Wingate By Wyndham Alpharetta	Alpharetta	1005 Kingswood Pl	26.48416666666667	399.6000053882599
Ramada-ankeny	Ankeny	133 Se Delaware Ave	26.27166666666665	2917.2999782562256
Best Western Appleton Inn	Appleton	3033 W College Ave	26.837499999999995	964.8999977111816
Copperleaf Hotel	Appleton	300 W College Ave	26.837499999999995	964.8999977111816
Fairfield Inn Appleton	Appleton	132 N Mall Dr	26.837499999999995	964.8999977111816
Comfort Suites Outlet Center	Asheville	890 Brevard Rd	26.797499999999996	2264.600009918213
Americas Best Value Inn	Auburn	170 Center St	24.35666666666666	1507.1000146865845
Auburn Travelodge Inn & Suites	Auburn	9 16th St Nw	24.35666666666666	1507.1000146865845
Hearthside Village Cottage Motel	Bethlehem	1267 Main St	24.617499999999996	1244.600020647049
Historic Hotel Bethlehem	Bethlehem	437 Main St	24.617499999999996	1244.600020647049
Holiday Inn Express & Suites Bethlehem	Bethlehem	2201 Cherry Ln	24.617499999999996	1244.600020647049
Residence Inn Allentown Bethlehem/Lehigh Valley Airport	Bethlehem	2180 Motel Dr	24.617499999999996	1244.600020647049

Command:

Analysis before indexing:

```
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=123.81 rows=301) (actual time=1.327..3.185 rows=222 loops=1)
| -> Filter: ((City_LivingWage < (select $43)) and (City_CrimeRate < (select $44))) (cost=18.36 rows=166) (actual time=1.208..1.853 rows=242 loops=1)
| -> Table scan on City (cost=18.36 rows=1495) (actual time=0.047..0.497 rows=1495 loops=1)
| -> Select $43 (subquery in condition; run only once)
| -> Aggregate: avg(City_LivingWage) (cost=300.75 rows=1) (actual time=0.576..0.576 rows=1 loops=1)
| -> Table scan on City (cost=151.55 rows=1495) (actual time=0.038..0.442 rows=1495 loops=1)
| -> Aggregate: avg(City_CrimeRate) (cost=300.75 rows=1) (actual time=0.540..0.540 rows=1 loops=1)
| -> Table scan on City (cost=151.25 rows=1495) (actual time=0.031..0.422 rows=1495 loops=1)
| -> Index lookup on H using idx_hotel_cityname (CityName=City. Name ) (cost=0.45 rows=2) (actual time=0.005..0.005 rows=1 loops=242)
| 1 row in set (0.01 sec)
```

Attempt 1: Index on LivingWage

```
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=215.32 rows=267) (actual time=0.556..2.301 rows=222 loops=1)
    -> Filter: ((City.LivingWage < (select #3)) and (City.CrimeRate < (select #4))) (cost=121.78 rows=147) (actual time=0.530..1.132 rows=242 loops=1)
    -> Table scan on City (cost=121.78 rows=1495) (actual time=0.047.0.474 rows=1495 loops=1)
    -> Select #3 (subquery in condition; run only once)
    -> Aggregate: avg(City.LivingWage) (cost=300.75 rows=1) (actual time=0.422..0.422 rows=1 loops=1)
    -> Select #4 (subquery in condition; run only once)
    -> Aggregate: avg(City.CrimeRate) (cost=300.75 rows=1) (actual time=0.473..0.473 rows=1 loops=1)
    -> Aggregate: avg(City.CrimeRate) (cost=300.75 rows=1) (actual time=0.473..0.473 rows=1 loops=1)
    -> Table scan on City (cost=151.25 rows=1495) (actual time=0.032..0.370 rows=1495 loops=1)
    -> Index lookup on H using idx_hotel_cityname (CityName=City.Name) (cost=0.45 rows=2) (actual time=0.004..0.005 rows=1 loops=242)

1 row in set (0.01 sec)
```

Similarly, we expected to improve performance by indexing attributes in the WHERE clause, such as 'LivingWage'. Contrary to our expectations, not only did we fail to see a decrease in query cost, but we also experienced a decline in performance. We suspect that the relatively small size of our table is insufficient to demonstrate notable benefits. Furthermore, the additional overhead associated with implementing the index has negatively impacted overall performance.

Attempt 2: Index on CrimeRate

```
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=252.52 rows=256) (actual time=0.578..2.493 rows=222 loops=1)
-> Filter: ((City.LivingWage < (select #3)) and (City.CrimeRate < (select #4))) (cost=162.79 rows=141) (actual time=0.504..1.233 rows=242 loops=1)
-> Index range scan on City using idx_crimerate over (WULL < CrimeRate < 4225.994471099387) (cost=162.79 rows=424) (actual time=0.014..0.664 rows=424 loops=1)
-> Select #3 (subquery in condition; run only once)
-> Aggregate: avg(City.LivingWage) (cost=300.75 rows=1) (actual time=0.475..0.475 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Select #4 (subquery in condition; run only once)
-> Select #4 (subquery in condition; run only once)
-> Aggregate: avg(City.crimeRate) (cost=151.25 rows=1495) (actual time=0.396..0.396 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Covering index scan on City (cost=300.75 rows=1) (actual time=0.396..0.396 rows=1 loops=1)
-> Index lookup on H using idx_hotel_cityname (CityName=City. Name') (cost=0.45 rows=2) (actual time=0.004..0.005 rows=1 loops=242)

1 row in set (0.01 sec)
```

Once again, we expected to improve performance by indexing attributes in the WHERE clause, such as 'CrimeRate'. Contrary to our expectations, not only did we fail to see a decrease in query cost, but we also experienced a decline in performance. We suspect that the relatively small size of our table is insufficient to demonstrate notable benefits. Furthermore, the additional overhead associated with implementing the index has negatively impacted overall performance.

Attempt 3: Index on LivingWage and CrimeRate (composite index)

Creating a composite index on 'LivingWage' and 'CrimeRate' has yielded the same results as previously observed.

Advanced Query 4

Advanced features: join multiple relations, subqueries SELECT

H.Name AS HotelName, H.Address, H.CityName, C.State,

CASE

WHEN P.Month IN (3, 4, 5) THEN 'Spring' WHEN P.Month IN (6, 7, 8) THEN 'Summer' WHEN P.Month IN (9, 10, 11) THEN 'Fall' ELSE 'Winter'

END AS Season,

ROUND(AVG(P.Precipitation), 3) AS AvgPrecipitation

FROM Hotel H

JOIN City C ON H.CityName = C.Name JOIN Precipitation P ON C.State = P.CityState

GROUP BY

H.Name,

H.Address,

H.CityName,

C.State,

Season

ORDER BY

H.Name, Season

LIMIT 15;

Top 15 results:

HotelName	Address	CityName	State	Season	AvgPrecipitatio
AC Hotel by Marriott Boston Downtown	225 Albany Street	Boston	Massachusetts	Fall	3.78
AC Hotel by Marriott Boston Downtown	225 Albany Street	Boston	Massachusetts	Spring	3.8
C Hotel by Marriott Boston Downtown	225 Albany Street	Boston	Massachusetts	Summer	3.45
C Hotel by Marriott Boston Downtown	225 Albany Street	Boston	Massachusetts	Winter	3.45
C Hotel Chicago Downtown	630 North Rush Street	Chicago	Illinois	Fall	3.32
AC Hotel Chicago Downtown	630 North Rush Street	Chicago	Illinois	Spring	3.4
C Hotel Chicago Downtown	630 North Rush Street	Chicago	Illinois	Summer	4.0
C Hotel Chicago Downtown	630 North Rush Street	Chicago	Illinois	Winter	2.1
C Hotel Miami Beach	2912 Collins Ave	Miami Beach	Florida	Fall	3.80
C Hotel Miami Beach	2912 Collins Ave	Miami Beach	Florida	Spring	4.15
C Hotel Miami Beach	2912 Collins Ave	Miami Beach	Florida	Summer	7.41
C Hotel Miami Beach	2912 Collins Ave	Miami Beach	Florida	Winter	4.36
ce Hotel Chicago	311 North Morgan Street	Chicago	Illinois	Fall	3.32
ce Hotel Chicago	311 North Morgan Street	Chicago	Illinois	Spring	3.4
ce Hotel Chicago	311 North Morgan Street	Chicago	Illinois	Summer	4.0

Analysis before indexing:

```
| -> Limit: 20 row(s) (actual time=34.205..34.211 rows=20 loops=1)
-> Sort: H. Name', Season, limit input to 20 row(s) per chunk (actual time=34.204..34.209 rows=20 loops=1)
-> Table scan on <temporary (actual time=32.169..32.966 rows=2996 loops=1)
-> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=32.166..32.166 rows=2996 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=3529.66 rows=22210) (actual time=0.106..10.415 rows=8988 loops=1)
-> Nested loop inner join (cost=838.30 rows=1854) (actual time=0.088..4.248 rows=749 loops=1)
-> Table scan on H (cost=1838.30 rows=1854) (actual time=0.088..4.248 rows=749 loops=1)
-> Table scan on H (cost=1838.40 rows=1854) (actual time=0.082..0.339 rows=1854 loops=1)
-> Filter: (C.State is not null) (cost=0.25 rows=1) (actual time=0.002..0.002 rows=0 loops=1854)
-> Single-row index lookup on C using PRIMARY (Name=H.CityMane) (cost=0.25 rows=1) (actual time=0.001..0.001 rows=1 loops=1854)
-> Index lookup on P using PRIMARY (CityState=C.State) (cost=0.25 rows=12) (actual time=0.005..0.007 rows=12 loops=749)
```

Attempt 1: Index on Precipitation

```
| -> Limit: 20 row(s) (actual time=33.356..33.362 rows=20 loops=1)
| -> Sort: H. Name', Season, limit input to 20 row(s) per chunk (actual time=33.355..33.359 rows=20 loops=1)
| -> Table scan on <temporary> (actual time=31.381..32.194 rows=2996 loops=1)
| -> Aggregate using temporary table (actual time=31.378.31.378 rows=2996 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=3529.66 rows=22210) (actual time=0.102..10.047 rows=8988 loops=1)
| -> Nested loop inner join (cost=838.30 rows=1854) (actual time=0.102..10.047 rows=8988 loops=1)
| -> Table scan on H (cost=189.40 rows=1854) (actual time=0.059..0.819 rows=749 loops=1)
| -> Filter: (C.State is not null) (cost=0.25 rows=1) (actual time=0.002..0.002 rows=10ops=1854)
| -> Single-row index lookup on C using PRIMARY (Name=H.CityName) (cost=0.25 rows=1) (actual time=0.001..0.001 rows=1 loops=1854)
| -> Index lookup on P using PRIMARY (CityState=C.State) (cost=0.25 rows=12) (actual time=0.005..0.007 rows=12 loops=749)
```

The addition of an index on the attribute present in the SELECT clause, specifically 'Precipitation,' was not expected to influence the cost. The outcomes of our analysis align with these expectations, confirming that the index has no impact on query cost.

Attempt 2: Index on Address

We aimed to boost performance by indexing attributes in the GROUP BY clause, like 'Address'. The idea was that indexing would quickly group identical values, enhancing efficiency. Yet, we haven't seen a decrease in query costs. It seems the scale of our table might not be large enough to manifest significant improvements, given that the advantages of indexing are counterbalanced by the implementation's overhead.

Attempt 3: Index on 'Precipitation' and 'Address'

Creating a composite index on 'Precipitation' and 'Address' has yielded the same results as previously observed.