ICS 321 Fall 2013
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

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

Student	Course	Instructor
Smith	OS	Mark

$\longrightarrow$

Student	Instructor
Smith	Mark

Course	Instructor
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.
  - $F=\{A \to B,\ B \to C,\ C \to A\}$.
  - Is this dependency preserving?
- Dependency preserving does not imply lossless join:
  - Eg. ABC, $A \to B$, 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 $X \to Y$ violates BCNF,
    decompose R into R-Y and XY
  - Repeat until all relations are in BCNF.
- Example: ABCD, $B \to C$, $C \to D$, $C \to A$.
- 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→C, TiC→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 $\rightarrow$ 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.