

7.1

**Answer:** A decomposition  $\{R_1, R_2\}$  is a lossless-join decomposition if  $R_1 \cap R_2 \rightarrow R_1$  or  $R_1 \cap R_2 \rightarrow R_2$ . Let  $R_1 = (A, B, C)$ ,  $R_2 = (A, D, E)$ , and  $R_1 \cap R_2 = A$ . Since  $A$  is a candidate key (see Exercise 7.11), Therefore  $R_1 \cap R_2 \rightarrow R_1$ .

7.2

**Answer:** The nontrivial functional dependencies are:  $A \rightarrow B$  and  $C \rightarrow B$ , and a dependency they logically imply:  $AC \rightarrow B$ . There are 19 trivial functional dependencies of the form  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ , where  $\beta \subseteq \alpha$ .  $C$  does not functionally determine  $A$  because the first and third tuples have the same  $C$  but different  $A$  values. The same tuples also show  $B$  does not functionally determine  $A$ . Likewise,  $A$  does not functionally determine  $C$  because the first two tuples have the same  $A$  value and different  $C$  values. The same tuples also show  $B$  does not functionally determine  $C$ .

7.3

**Answer:** Let  $Pk(r)$  denote the primary key attribute of relation  $r$ .

- The functional dependencies  $Pk(account) \rightarrow Pk(customer)$  and  $Pk(customer) \rightarrow Pk(account)$  indicate a one-to-one relationship because any two tuples with the same value for account must have the same value for customer, and any two tuples agreeing on customer must have the same value for account.
- The functional dependency  $Pk(account) \rightarrow Pk(customer)$  indicates a many-to-one relationship since any account value which is repeated will have the same customer value, but many account values may have the same customer value.

7.4

**Answer:** To prove that:

$$\text{if } \alpha \rightarrow \beta \text{ and } \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \text{ then } \alpha \rightarrow \beta\gamma$$

Following the hint, we derive:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha \rightarrow \beta & \text{given} \\ \alpha\alpha \rightarrow \alpha\beta & \text{augmentation rule} \\ \alpha \rightarrow \alpha\beta & \text{union of identical sets} \\ \alpha \rightarrow \gamma & \text{given} \\ \alpha\beta \rightarrow \gamma\beta & \text{augmentation rule} \\ \alpha \rightarrow \beta\gamma & \text{transitivity rule and set union commutativity} \end{array}$$

7.5

**Answer:** Proof using Armstrong's axioms of the Pseudotransitivity Rule:if  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$  and  $\gamma\beta \rightarrow \delta$ , then  $\alpha\gamma \rightarrow \delta$ .

$\alpha \rightarrow \beta$	given
$\alpha\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\beta$	augmentation rule and set union commutativity
$\gamma\beta \rightarrow \delta$	given
$\alpha\gamma \rightarrow \delta$	transitivity rule

7.6

**Answer:** Compute the closure of the following set  $F$  of functional dependencies for relation schema  $R = (A, B, C, D, E)$ .
$$\begin{aligned}
 A &\rightarrow BC \\
 CD &\rightarrow E \\
 B &\rightarrow D \\
 E &\rightarrow A
 \end{aligned}$$
List the candidate keys for  $R$ .

Note: It is not reasonable to expect students to enumerate all of  $F^+$ . Some short-hand representation of the result should be acceptable as long as the nontrivial members of  $F^+$  are found.

Starting with  $A \rightarrow BC$ , we can conclude:  $A \rightarrow B$  and  $A \rightarrow C$ .

Since $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow D$ , $A \rightarrow D$	(decomposition, transitive)
Since $A \rightarrow CD$ and $CD \rightarrow E$ , $A \rightarrow E$	(union, decomposition, transitive)
Since $A \rightarrow A$ , we have	(reflexive)
$A \rightarrow ABCDE$ from the above steps	(union)
Since $E \rightarrow A$ , $E \rightarrow ABCDE$	(transitive)
Since $CD \rightarrow E$ , $CD \rightarrow ABCDE$	(transitive)
Since $B \rightarrow D$ and $BC \rightarrow CD$ , $BC \rightarrow ABCDE$	(augmentative, transitive)
Also, $C \rightarrow C$ , $D \rightarrow D$ , $BD \rightarrow D$ , etc.	

Therefore, any functional dependency with  $A$ ,  $E$ ,  $BC$ , or  $CD$  on the left hand side of the arrow is in  $F^+$ , no matter which other attributes appear in the FD. Allow  $*$  to represent any set of attributes in  $R$ , then  $F^+$  is  $BD \rightarrow B$ ,  $BD \rightarrow D$ ,  $C \rightarrow C$ ,  $D \rightarrow D$ ,  $BD \rightarrow BD$ ,  $B \rightarrow D$ ,  $B \rightarrow B$ ,  $B \rightarrow BD$ , and all FDs of the form  $A* \rightarrow \alpha$ ,  $BC* \rightarrow \alpha$ ,  $CD* \rightarrow \alpha$ ,  $E* \rightarrow \alpha$  where  $\alpha$  is any subset of  $\{A, B, C, D, E\}$ . The candidate keys are  $A$ ,  $BC$ ,  $CD$ , and  $E$ .

7.9

**Answer:**

- a. The query is given below. Its result is non-empty if and only if  $b \rightarrow c$  does not hold on  $r$ .

```
select b
from r
group by b
having count(distinct c) > 1
```

b.

```
create assertion b-to-c check
(not exists
  (select b
   from r
   group by b
   having count(distinct c) > 1
  )
)
```

7.11

**Answer:** The dependency  $B \rightarrow D$  is not preserved.  $F_1$ , the restriction of  $F$  to  $(A, B, C)$  is  $A \rightarrow ABC, A \rightarrow AB, A \rightarrow AC, A \rightarrow BC, A \rightarrow B, A \rightarrow C, A \rightarrow A, B \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow C, AB \rightarrow AC, AB \rightarrow ABC, AB \rightarrow BC, AB \rightarrow AB, AB \rightarrow A, AB \rightarrow B, AB \rightarrow C, AC$  (same as  $AB$ ),  $BC$  (same as  $AB$ ),  $ABC$  (same as  $AB$ ).  $F_2$ , the restriction of  $F$  to  $(C, D, E)$  is  $A \rightarrow ADE, A \rightarrow AD, A \rightarrow AE, A \rightarrow DE, A \rightarrow A, A \rightarrow D, A \rightarrow E, D \rightarrow D, E$  (same as  $A$ ),  $AD, AE, DE, ADE$  (same as  $A$ ).  $(F_1 \cup F_2)^+$  is easily seen not to contain  $B \rightarrow D$  since the only FD in  $F_1 \cup F_2$  with  $B$  as the left side is  $B \rightarrow B$ , a trivial FD. We shall see in Exercise 7.22 that  $B \rightarrow D$  is indeed in  $F^+$ . Thus  $B \rightarrow D$  is not preserved. Note that  $CD \rightarrow ABCDE$  is also not preserved.

A simpler argument is as follows:  $F_1$  contains no dependencies with  $D$  on the right side of the arrow.  $F_2$  contains no dependencies with  $B$  on the left side of the arrow. Therefore for  $B \rightarrow D$  to be preserved there must be an FD  $B \rightarrow \alpha$  in  $F_1^+$  and  $\alpha \rightarrow D$  in  $F_2^+$  (so  $B \rightarrow D$  would follow by transitivity). Since the intersection of the two schemes is  $A$ ,  $\alpha = A$ . Observe that  $B \rightarrow A$  is not in  $F_1^+$  since  $B^+ = BD$ .

7.12

**Answer:** Let  $F$  be a set of functional dependencies that hold on a schema  $R$ . Let  $\sigma = \{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n\}$  be a dependency-preserving 3NF decomposition of  $R$ . Let  $X$  be a candidate key for  $R$ .

Consider a legal instance  $r$  of  $R$ . Let  $j = \Pi_X(r) \bowtie \Pi_{R_1}(r) \bowtie \Pi_{R_2}(r) \dots \bowtie \Pi_{R_n}(r)$ . We want to prove that  $r = j$ .

We claim that if  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are two tuples in  $j$  such that  $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$ , then  $t_1 = t_2$ . To prove this claim, we use the following inductive argument –

Let  $F' = F_1 \cup F_2 \cup \dots \cup F_n$ , where each  $F_i$  is the restriction of  $F$  to the schema  $R_i$  in  $\sigma$ . Consider the use of the algorithm given in Figure 7.7 to compute the closure of  $X$  under  $F'$ . We use induction on the number of times that the *for* loop in this algorithm is executed.

- *Basis* : In the first step of the algorithm, *result* is assigned to  $X$ , and hence given that  $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$ , we know that  $t_1[\text{result}] = t_2[\text{result}]$  is true.
- *Induction Step* : Let  $t_1[\text{result}] = t_2[\text{result}]$  be true at the end of the  $k$  th execution of the *for* loop.

Suppose the functional dependency considered in the  $k + 1$  th execution of the *for* loop is  $\beta \rightarrow \gamma$ , and that  $\beta \subseteq \text{result}$ .  $\beta \subseteq \text{result}$  implies that  $t_1[\beta] = t_2[\beta]$  is true. The facts that  $\beta \rightarrow \gamma$  holds for some attribute set  $R_i$  in  $\sigma$ , and that  $t_1[R_i]$  and  $t_2[R_i]$  are in  $\Pi_{R_i}(r)$  imply that  $t_1[\gamma] = t_2[\gamma]$  is also true. Since  $\gamma$  is now added to *result* by the algorithm, we know that  $t_1[\text{result}] = t_2[\text{result}]$  is true at the end of the  $k + 1$  th execution of the *for* loop.

Since  $\sigma$  is dependency-preserving and  $X$  is a key for  $R$ , all attributes in  $R$  are in *result* when the algorithm terminates. Thus,  $t_1[R] = t_2[R]$  is true, that is,  $t_1 = t_2$  – as claimed earlier.

Our claim implies that the size of  $\Pi_X(j)$  is equal to the size of  $j$ . Note also that  $\Pi_X(j) = \Pi_X(r) = r$  (since  $X$  is a key for  $R$ ). Thus we have proved that the size of  $j$  equals that of  $r$ . Using the result of Exercise 7.17, we know that  $r \subseteq j$ . Hence we conclude that  $r = j$ .

Note that since  $X$  is trivially in 3NF,  $\sigma \cup \{X\}$  is a dependency-preserving lossless-join decomposition into 3NF.

7.17

**Answer:**

- Repetition of information is a condition in a relational database where the values of one attribute are determined by the values of another attribute in the same relation, and both values are repeated throughout the relation. This is a bad relational database design because it increases the storage required for the relation and it makes updating the relation more difficult.
- Inability to represent information is a condition where a relationship exists among only a proper subset of the attributes in a relation. This is bad relational database design because all the unrelated attributes must be filled with null values otherwise a tuple without the unrelated information cannot be inserted into the relation.
- Loss of information is a condition of a relational database which results from the decomposition of one relation into two relations and which cannot be combined to recreate the original relation. It is a bad relational database design because certain queries cannot be answered using the reconstructed relation that could have been answered using the original relation.

7.18

**Answer:** Certain functional dependencies are called trivial functional dependencies because they are satisfied by all relations.

7.19

**Answer:** The definition of functional dependency is:  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$  holds on  $R$  if in any legal relation  $r(R)$ , for all pairs of tuples  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  in  $r$  such that  $t_1[\alpha] = t_2[\alpha]$ , it is also the case that  $t_1[\beta] = t_2[\beta]$ .

Reflexivity rule: if  $\alpha$  is a set of attributes, and  $\beta \subseteq \alpha$ , then  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ .  
Assume  $\exists t_1$  and  $t_2$  such that  $t_1[\alpha] = t_2[\alpha]$

$t_1[\beta] = t_2[\beta]$     since  $\beta \subseteq \alpha$   
 $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$     definition of FD

Augmentation rule: if  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$ , and  $\gamma$  is a set of attributes, then  $\gamma\alpha \rightarrow \gamma\beta$ .  
Assume  $\exists t_1, t_2$  such that  $t_1[\gamma\alpha] = t_2[\gamma\alpha]$

$t_1[\gamma] = t_2[\gamma]$      $\gamma \subseteq \gamma\alpha$   
 $t_1[\alpha] = t_2[\alpha]$      $\alpha \subseteq \gamma\alpha$   
 $t_1[\beta] = t_2[\beta]$     definition of  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$   
 $t_1[\gamma\beta] = t_2[\gamma\beta]$      $\gamma\beta = \gamma \cup \beta$   
 $\gamma\alpha \rightarrow \gamma\beta$     definition of FD

Transitivity rule: if  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$  and  $\beta \rightarrow \gamma$ , then  $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ .

Assume  $\exists t_1, t_2$  such that  $t_1[\alpha] = t_2[\alpha]$

$t_1[\beta] = t_2[\beta]$     definition of  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$   
 $t_1[\gamma] = t_2[\gamma]$     definition of  $\beta \rightarrow \gamma$   
 $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$     definition of FD

7.21

**Answer:** The decomposition rule, and its derivation from Armstrong's axioms are given below:

if  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta\gamma$ , then  $\alpha \rightarrow \beta$  and  $\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ .

$\alpha \rightarrow \beta\gamma$  given

$\beta\gamma \rightarrow \beta$  reflexivity rule

$\alpha \rightarrow \beta$  transitivity rule

$\beta\gamma \rightarrow \gamma$  reflexive rule

$\alpha \rightarrow \gamma$  transitive rule

7.23

**Answer:** Following the hint, use the following example of  $r$ :

A	B	C	D	E
$a_1$	$b_1$	$c_1$	$d_1$	$e_1$
$a_2$	$b_2$	$c_1$	$d_2$	$e_2$

With  $R_1 = (A, B, C)$ ,  $R_2 = (C, D, E)$ :

a.  $\Pi_{R_1}(r)$  would be:

A	B	C
$a_1$	$b_1$	$c_1$
$a_2$	$b_2$	$c_1$

b.  $\Pi_{R_2}(r)$  would be:

C	D	E
$c_1$	$d_1$	$e_1$
$c_1$	$d_2$	$e_2$

c.  $\Pi_{R_1}(r) \bowtie \Pi_{R_2}(r)$  would be:

A	B	C	D	E
$a_1$	$b_1$	$c_1$	$d_1$	$e_1$
$a_1$	$b_1$	$c_1$	$d_2$	$e_2$
$a_2$	$b_2$	$c_1$	$d_1$	$e_1$
$a_2$	$b_2$	$c_1$	$d_2$	$e_2$

Clearly,  $\Pi_{R_1}(r) \bowtie \Pi_{R_2}(r) \neq r$ . Therefore, this is a lossy join.

7.26

**Answer:** BCNF is not always dependency preserving. Therefore, we may want to choose another normal form (specifically, 3NF) in order to make checking dependencies easier during updates. This would avoid joins to check dependencies and increase system performance.