ICS 321 Fall 2012
Normal Forms (ii)

Asst. Prof. Lipyeow Lim
Information & Computer Science Department
University of Hawaii at Manoa

Redundancies & Decompositions

Hourly_Emps

SSN	Name	Lot	Rating	Hourly_wages	Hours_worked
123-22-2366	Attishoo	48	8	10	40
231-31-5368	Smiley	22	8	10	30
131-24-3650	Smethurst	35	5	7	30
434-26-3751	Guldu	35	5	7	32
612-67-4134	Madayan	35	8	10	40

Hourly_Emps

SSN	Name	Lot	Rating	Hours_ worked
123-22-2366	Attishoo	48	8	40
231-31-5368	Smiley	22	8	30
131-24-3650	Smethurst	35	5	30
434-26-3751	Guldu	35	5	32
612-67-4134	Madayan	35	8	40

RatingWages

Rating	Hourly_ wages
5	7
8	10

Decompositions

- Reduces redundancies and anomalies, but could have the following potential problems:
  1. Some queries become more expensive.
  2. Given instances of the decomposed relations, we may not be able to reconstruct the corresponding instance of the original relation!
  3. Checking some dependencies may require joining the instances of the decomposed relations.
- Two desirable properties:
  - Lossless-join decomposition
  - Dependency-preserving decomposition

Lossless-join Decomposition

- Decomposition of R into X and Y is *lossless-join* w.r.t. a set of FDs F if, for every instance *r* that satisfies F:

  $$\pi_X(r) \text{ join } \pi_Y(r) = r$$

- In general one direction $\pi_X(r) \text{ join } \pi_Y(r) \supseteq r$ is always true, but the other may not hold.
- Definition extended to decomposition into 3 or more relations in a straightforward way.
- *It is essential that all decompositions used to deal with redundancy be lossless! (Avoids Problem (2).)*

Conditions for Lossless Join

- The decomposition of R into X and Y is lossless-join wrt F if and only if the closure of F contains:
  - $X \cap Y \rightarrow X$, or
  - $X \cap Y \rightarrow Y$
- In particular, the decomposition of R into UV and R - V is lossless-join if $U \rightarrow V$ holds over R.

A	B	C
1	2	3
4	5	6
7	2	8

A	B
1	2
4	5
7	2

B	C
2	3
5	6
2	8

A	B	C
1	2	3
4	5	6
7	2	8
1	2	8
7	2	3

Chase Test for Lossless Join

- R(A,B,C,D) is decomposed into S1={A,D}, S2={A,C}, S3={B,C,D}
- Construct a Tableau
  - One row for each decomposed relation
  - For each row i, subscript an attribute with i if it does not occur in Si.
- FDs: $A \rightarrow B$, $B \rightarrow C$, $CD \rightarrow A$
- Rules for "equating two rows" ***using FDs***:
  - If one is unsubscripted, make the other the same
  - If both are subscripted, make the subscripts the same
- Goal: one unsubscripted row

A	B	C	D	
a	b_1	c_1	d	S1
a	b_2	c	d_2	S2
a_3	b	c	d	S3

A	B	C	D
a	b_1	$\cancel{c_1}$ c	d
a	$\cancel{b_2}b_1$	c	d_2
$\cancel{a_3}$ a	b	c	d

one unsubscripted row imply lossless join

Dependency-preserving Decomposition

<u>Student</u>	<u>Course</u>	Instructor
Smith	OS	Mark

$\rightarrow$

<u>Student</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
Smith	Mark

Course	<u>Instructor</u>
OS	Mark

F= { SC $\rightarrow$ I, I$\rightarrow$C }

Checking SC $\rightarrow$ I requires a join!

- Dependency preserving decomposition (Intuitive):
  - If R is decomposed into X, Y and Z, and we enforce the FDs that hold on X, on Y and on Z, then all FDs that were given to hold on R must also hold. *(Avoids Problem (3).)*
- *Projection of set of FDs F*: If R is decomposed into X, ... projection of F onto X (denoted F_X) is the set of FDs $U \rightarrow V$ in F^+ (*closure of F*) such that U, V are in X.

Dependency-preserving Decomp. (Cont)

Important : F^+, not F

Decomposition of R into X and Y is
dependency preserving if $(F_X \text{ union } F_Y)^+ = F^+$

- If we consider only dependencies in the closure F^+ that can be checked in X without considering Y, and in Y without considering X, these imply all dependencies in F^+.
- Example: ABC decomposed into AB and BC.
  - $F=\{A \rightarrow B, \ B \rightarrow C, \ C \rightarrow A\}$.
  - Is this dependency preserving?
- Dependency preserving does not imply lossless join:
  - Eg. ABC, $A \rightarrow B$, decomposed into AB and BC.
  - And vice-versa! (Example?)

Decomposition into BCNF

- Consider relation R with FDs F. *How do we decompose R into a set of small relations that are in BCNF ?*
- Algorithm:
  - If $X \rightarrow Y$ violates BCNF,
    decompose R into R-Y and XY
  - Repeat until all relations are in BCNF.
- Example: ABCD, $B \rightarrow C$, $C \rightarrow D$, $C \rightarrow A$.
- Order in which we deal with the violating FD can lead to different relations!

BCNF Decomposition Algorithm (3.20)

- **Input**: R_0, set of FDs S_0
- **Output**: A decomposition of R_0 into a collection of relations, all of which are in BCNF
- Initially $R = R_0$, $S=S_0$

1. If R is in BCNF, return {R}
2. Let $X \rightarrow Y$ be a violation.
   a. Compute X+.
   b. Choose R_1=X+
   c. Let R_2 = X union (R-X+)
3. Compute FD projections S_1 and S_2 for R_1 and R_2
4. Recursively decompose R_1 and R_2 and return the union of the results

BCNF & Dependency Preservation

- BCNF decomposition using Algo 3.20 is lossless join
- BUT in general there may not be a dependency preserving decomposition into BCNF
  - Example: Bookings(**Ti**tle, **C**ity, **Th**eater), with FD's : Th$\rightarrow$C, TiC$\rightarrow$Th
  - Not in BCNF.
  - Can't decompose while preserving 2nd FD;
- This is the motivation for 3NF.

Decomposition into 3NF

- Obviously, the algorithm for lossless join decomp into BCNF can be used to obtain a lossless join decomp into 3NF (typically, can stop earlier).
- How can we ensure dependency preservation ?
  - If $X \rightarrow Y$ is not preserved, add relation XY.
  - Problem is that XY may violate 3NF!
  - Example: $JP \rightarrow C$ is not preserved, so add JPC. What if FDs also include $J \rightarrow C$?
- Refinement: Instead of the given set of FDs F, use a *minimal cover for F*.

Minimum Cover for a Set of FDs

- ***Minimal cover or basis*** G for a set of FDs F:
  - Closure of F = closure of G.
  - Right hand side of each FD in G is a single attribute.
  - If we modify G by deleting an FD or by deleting attributes from an FD in G, the closure changes.
- Intuitively, every FD in G is needed, and ``*as small as possible*'' in order to get the same closure as F.
- e.g., $A \rightarrow B$, $ABCD \rightarrow E$, $EF \rightarrow GH$, $ACDF \rightarrow EG$ has the following minimal cover:
  - $A \rightarrow B$, $ACD \rightarrow E$, $EF \rightarrow G$ and $EF \rightarrow H$

Computing the Minimal Cover

- Algorithm
  1. **Put the FDs into standard form $X \rightarrow A$**. RHS is a single attribute.
  2. **Minimize the LHS of each FD**. For each FD, check if we can delete an attribute from LHS while preserving F^+.
  3. **Delete redundant FDs**.
- Minimal covers are not unique. Different order of computation can give different covers.
- e.g., $A \rightarrow B$, $ABCD \rightarrow E$, $EF \rightarrow GH$, $ACDF \rightarrow EG$ has the following minimal cover:
  - $A \rightarrow B$, $ACD \rightarrow E$, $EF \rightarrow G$ and $EF \rightarrow H$

3NF Decomposition Algorithm (3.26)

- **Input**: R, set of FDs F
- **Output**: A decomposition of R into a collection of relations, all of which are in BCNF

1. Find a minimal basis/cover for F, say G
2. For each FD **X → A** in G, use **XA** as one of the decomposed relations.
3. If none of the relations from Step 2 is a superkey for R, add another relation whose schema is a key for R.

Summary of Schema Refinement

- If a relation is in BCNF, it is free of redundancies that can be detected using FDs. Thus, trying to ensure that all relations are in BCNF is a good heuristic
- If a relation is not in BCNF, we can try to decompose it into a collection of BCNF relations.
  - Must consider whether all FDs are preserved.
  - If a lossless-join, dependency preserving decomposition into BCNF is not possible (or unsuitable, given typical queries), should consider decomposition into 3NF.
  - Decompositions should be carried out and/or re-examined while keeping *performance requirements* in mind.