### **Table of Contents**

1.	Running Total	1
	Using a variable: This is a MySQL trick	
	Using a join	
	Alternate approach	
	Moving Aggregates	

Running totals and moving totals/aggregates are two types of queries that are often used in business situations. In SQL there is generally more than one way to accomplish a task and this shows you several approaches to solve problems. Several of these use subqueries and self joins that are not the regular equality join that we have been using over the semester. You can find a variety of techniques for this posted on the internet and these techniques may be very slow for large tables. This may be a situation where, if the tables are large, that you should take the data into an application program that is more efficient for this processing.

In the database world we think of a table as a structure where the ordering of the rows is not significant; with a running total or moving average, the order of the rows is significant. So these techniques will seem somewhat contrived in SQL.

# 1. Running Total

A running total is a value that totals some value on its row and on the preceding rows. The first row would show the total of some attribute of row 1; the second row the total of row 1 to row 2; the third row the total of row 1 to row 3, etc

Suppose your first 6 assignment score were: 30,27, 30, 20, 30, 24; the third column is a running total of your scores; the fourth column is the running average

Assignment	Score	Running Total	Running Average		
1	30	30	100%		
2	27	57	95%		
3	30	87	97%		
4	20	107	89%		
5	30	137	91%		
6	24	161	89%		

### **1.1.** Using a variable: This is a MySQL trick

In these demos, we are calculating a running total of salaries for our table.

This version uses a variable to hold and calculate the total. If you use this approach, be certain to reset the variable after the query if you might run the query a second time in this session. With session level variables, you always need to consider if they have had a value set during the session- particularly when you use variables with names like @num, @x, @total.

In some situations, you will not be able to maintain the value of the variable and this technique will not workbut it is simple and shows you the interactions between the query proper and the session variables.

### Demo 01: Doing a running total of salaries, ordered by the department and employee id

+		+	- +		-+-	+
-	emp_id	dept_id		salary		RunningTotal
+	100	+   10		24000	-+·	24000
ĺ	201	20	ı	15000	İ	39000
İ	101	30	ĺ	98005	i	137005
Ì	108	30	ĺ	12000	İ	149005
	109	30	-	15000		164005
	110	30	-	30300		194305
	203	30		44450		238755
	204	30		15000		253755
	205	30		15000		268755
	206	30		88954		357709
	162	35		98000		455709
	200	35		65000		520709
	207	35		65000		585709
	145	80		65000		650709
	150	80		6500		657209
	155	80		80000		737209
	103	210		9000		746209
	104	210		50000		796209
	102	215		30300		826509
	146	215		88954		915463
	160	215		15000		930463
	161	215		15000		945463
+		+	- +		-+-	+

Demo 02: Doing a running total of salaries, ordered by the salary

22 rows in set (0.38 sec)

```
set @accum=0;
select emp_id, dept_id, salary
     , @accum := @accum + salary as RunningTotal
from a emp.adv emp
order \overline{b}y salary, emp id;
| emp id | dept id | salary | RunningTotal |
+----+
    150 |
           80 | 6500 |
                                 6500 I
    103 |
             210 | 9000 |
                                15500 |
    108 |
             30 | 12000 |
                                27500 |
    161 |
             215 | 15000 |
                                42500 |
            215 | 15000 |
    160 |
                                57500 |
             30 | 15000 |
                                72500 |
    205 |
              30 | 15000 |
    109 |
                                87500
                                102500 |
    201 I
             20 | 15000 |
    204 |
             30 | 15000 |
                                117500 |
    100 |
             10 | 24000 |
                               141500 |
    110 |
             30 | 30300 |
                                171800 I
    102 |
             215 | 30300 |
                                202100 |
    203 |
             30 |
                   44450 |
                                246550
```

50000 |

80000 |

35 | 65000 |

35 | 65000 |

80 | 65000 |

104 |

200 |

207 |

145 |

155 |

210 |

80 |

296550

361550 |

426550 |

491550 |

571550 |

Suppose we want a running total but we want less details and we want to see only department salary totals. This uses a subquery that assembles the data to be used and an outer query to do the aggregate.

### Demo 03:

```
set @total := 0;
select dept id, DeptTotal
, @total := @total + DeptTotal as RunningTotal
from (select dept id, sum(salary) as DeptTotal
      from a emp.adv emp
      group by dept id
      ) dt
order by dept_id;
+----+
| dept id | DeptTotal | RunningTotal |
+----+
      10 I
               24000 |
                               24000 I
              15000 |
                               39000 |
      20 |
    | 39000 | 39000 | 39000 | 30 | 318709 | 357709 | 35 | 228000 | 585709 | 80 | 151500 | 737209 | 210 | 59000 | 796209 | 215 | 149254 | 945463 |
7 rows in set (0.02 sec)
```

### 1.2. Using a join

If we do not want to use the variable, we can do a join. Note that the table is placed in the From clause twice-this is a self join. The join uses the <= operator.

One copy of the table is used to display the first three columns and the second copy of the table is used to calculate the running total.

Demo 04: use a self join; this may be slow with large tables

```
152305 I
    102 | 30300 |
    103 | 9000 |
                       161305 |
    104 | 50000 |
                       211305 |
    108 | 12000 |
                       223305 I
                       238305 I
    109 | 15000 |
                     268605 |
333605 |
422559 |
429059 |
509059 |
    110 | 30300 |
    145 | 65000 |
    146 | 88954 |
    150 | 6500 |
    155 | 80000 |
                       524059 |
    160 | 15000 |
                       539059 |
    161 | 15000 |
                       637059
    162 | 98000 |
                       702059 |
    200 | 65000 |
                       717059 I
    201 | 15000 |
    203 | 44450 |
                       761509 |
    204 | 15000 |
                       776509 I
    205 | 15000 |
                       791509 I
    206 | 88954 |
                       880463 |
    207 | 65000 | 945463 |
22 rows in set (0.03 sec)
```

### Going for the department salary total as the basis for the running total

## 1.3. Alternate approach

#### Demo 05: use a correlated subquery; this may be slow with large tables

1	104	1	50000	1	211305	ı
1	108		12000		223305	l I
I		ı		ı		l
	109		15000		238305	
	110		30300		268605	
	145		65000		333605	
	146		88954		422559	
	150		6500		429059	
	155		80000		509059	
	160		15000		524059	
	161		15000		539059	
	162		98000		637059	
	200		65000		702059	
	201		15000		717059	
	203		44450		761509	
	204		15000		776509	
	205		15000		791509	
	206	1	88954		880463	
	207		65000		945463	
+		-+-		+-		+

## 2. Moving Aggregates

This uses the adv\_sales table. That table has two attributes- the first is a date that runs in sequence. This represents the sales day in some time span. The second attribute is the total sales for that day.

These are the first few rows; with rows for the last 6 days of April and for each day in May

```
+----+
| sales_day | sales |
| 2011-04-25 | 400 |
| 2011-04-26 | 400 |
| 2011-04-27 | 400 |
| 2011-04-28 |
             300
| 2011-04-29 |
               900
| 2011-04-30 |
              580
| 2011-05-01 | 425
| 2011-05-02 |
               10 I
| 2011-05-03 |
               325 I
| 2011-05-04 | 500 |
```

What we want is a three day sales total. The first total is for days 1, 2, 3 in the table = 400 + 400 + 400 = 1200; the second total is for days 2, 3, 4 = 400 + 400 + 300 = 1100; the third total is for days 3, 4, 5 = 400 + 300 + 900 = 1600. Commonly this is done for the average sales to even out ups and downs in the data that might not be significant as a trend. I am using Sum because it is easier to calculate in your head to see that this is working correctly and we don't have to worry about rounding.

This uses the self join technique similar to that used above where we have two copies of the table and we do the join- not as an equals join but as a join to get the right days linked together. We can do this as shown here so that when we calculate the Sum we get the day we are looking at in a1 and that day and the next two days in a2.

We want to display the day, its sales and the three-day sum.

Demo 06: Note where we use table alias a1 and where table alias a2

```
al.sales day
, al.sales
       sum(a2.sales) as three day sum
from a_oe.adv_sales a1
       a_oe.adv_sales <mark>a2</mark>
join
  on
        a2.sales day between a1.sales day and date add(a1.sales day ,
interval 2 day)
group by al.sales day, al.sales
order by al.sales day
+----+
| sales_day | sales | three_day_sum |
+----+
| 2011-04-25 | 400 | 1200 |
| 2011-04-26 | 400 |
                             1100 I
| 2011-04-27 | 400 |
                             1600 I
                             1780 |
| 2011-04-28 | 300 |
| 2011-04-29 | 900 |
| 2011-04-30 | 580 |
                             1905 |
                            1015 |
                           760 |
835 |
1375 |
1050 |
| 2011-05-01 | 425 |
| 2011-05-02 | 10 |
| 2011-05-03 | 325 |
| 2011-05-04 | 500 |
| 2011-05-05 | 550 |
                             550 |
| 2011-05-06 | 0 |
| 2011-05-07 | 0 |
                              200 |
                              650 I
| 2011-05-08 | 200 |
                             1230 |
| 2011-05-09 | 450 |
                             1455 |
| 2011-05-10 | 580 |
                             1480 I
| 2011-05-11 | 425 |
                             1275 I
| 2011-05-12 | 475 |
                            1350 |
                            1350 |
1525 |
1700 |
1650 |
1500 |
1525 |
1525 |
| 2011-05-13 | 375 |
| 2011-05-14 | 500 |
| 2011-05-15 | 650 |
| 2011-05-16 | 550 |
| 2011-05-17 | 450 |
| 2011-05-18 | 500 |
| 2011-05-19 | 575 |
                             1525 |
| 2011-05-20 | 450 |
                             1525 |
| 2011-05-21 | 500 |
                             1925 |
| 2011-05-22 | 575 |
                             1925 |
| 2011-05-23 | 850 |
                             1925 |
| 2011-05-24 | 500 |
                             1575 I
| 2011-05-25 | 575 |
                             1650 |
| 2011-05-26 | 500 |
| 2011-05-27 | 575 |
                             1575 |
                             1650 |
| 2011-05-28 | 500 |
                            1650 I
                            1725 I
| 2011-05-29 | 575 |
| 2011-05-30 | 575 |
                             1150 I
| 2011-05-31 | 575 |
37 rows in set (0.00 sec)
```

This makes sense for the rows up to the last two- The sum for 2011-05-29 is for May 29, 30 and 31- which is three days

But the sum for 2011-05-30 is for two days only and sum for 2011-05-31 is for only one day. The table ends with May31; there are no rows for June 1 or 2. We might want to modify the query to skip the last two days. We do not want to write a where clause that says Where sales\_day not in ('2011-05-31, '2011-05-30') since the table might have different rows at other times. We want to say "do not include the last two rows".

We can modify the join as shown here to accomplish that. We essentially ask the table for the max date value and skip it and the previous date.

Demo 07: skipping the last two rows- The end-user might not understand why the rows for May 30 and 31 are missing.

Note that we can put some tests that we commonly think of as Where clause tests into the From clause.

#### Demo 08: Using only April 2011 dates

```
add the where clause
where month(al.sales day) = 4 and year (al.sales day) = 2011
+----+
| sales_day | sales | three_day_sum |
+----+
| 2011-04-25 | 400 |
                    1200 |
| 2011-04-26 | 400 |
                        1100 I
| 2011-04-27 | 400 |
                        1600 I
| 2011-04-28 | 300 |
                        1780 |
            900 |
| 2011-04-29 |
                        1905 |
| 2011-04-30 | 580 |
```