Tutorial 5: Logical Database Design

Jin, Ziyang Kim, # 34893140 # 3 f4a0b

Kim, Joon Hyung # 35183128 11m8

February 2018

StudentInfo(S, N, M, A, C, T, I, L, G)

with the following FDs:

- $1. S \rightarrow N$
- 2. C -> T, I
- 3. I -> L
- $4. S, C, M \rightarrow G$
- 5. S, M -> A
- $6. A \rightarrow M$

1 Find all keys and prove that you have found them all.

Since S and C do not appear in any RHS of the FDs, S and C must be part of every key.

(S C)⁺ = S C N T I L \neq SI, so (S C) is not a key.

Guess (S C M) and (S C A) are keys.

 $(S C M)^+ = (S C M N T I L G A) = SI so (S C M)$ is a superkey.

 $(S C A)^+ = (S C A N T I L G M) = SI so (S C A)$ is a superkey.

Since (S C) is not a key, so (S C M) and (S C A) are minimal, so they are keys.

Consider the maximal set $X \subseteq (S \ N \ M \ A \ C \ T \ I \ L \ G)$ such that $(S \ C) \subset X$ and A, $M \notin X$. The maximal such X is $(S \ N \ C \ T \ I \ L \ G)$ $X^+ = (S \ N \ C \ T \ I \ L \ G)^+ = S \ N \ C \ T \ I \ L \ G \neq SI$ So any set other than $(S \ C \ M)$ and $(S \ C \ A)$ cannot be a key.

Therefore, (S C M) and (S C A) are the only keys for the relation SI.

2 Find a minimal cover for this set of FDs.

- Put the FDs in a Standard Form.
 S->N, C->T, C->I, I->L, SCM->G, SM->A, A->M.
- 2. Minimize the Left Side of Each FD.
 - a) Single attribute left sides are already minimized.
 - b) For FD SCM->G, notice that S,C do not appear on LHS, and M cannot be reduced from S,C. Therefore the LHS is minimal.
 - c) For FD SM->A, notice that S does not appear on LHS, and M cannot be reduced from S. Therefore the LHS is minimal.

So the left sides are all minimized.

- 3. Delete Redundant FDs.
 - N, T, I, L, G, A, Monly appear once on RHS, so there is no redundant FD.

So the minimum cover for this set of FDs is:

- 1. S -> N
- 2. C -> T
- 3. C -> I
- 4. I -> L
- $5. S, C, M \rightarrow G$
- $6. S, M \rightarrow A$
- $7. A \rightarrow M$

3 Obtain a lossless-join, BCNF decomposition of StudentInfo.

For FD (1): S->N, we decompose SI to

S1 = (S N)

S2 = (S M A C T I L G)

For FD (3): I->L, we decompose S2 to

S3 = (I L)

S4 = (S M A C T I G)

For FD (2): C->T, I, we decompose S4 to

S5 = (C T I)

S6 = (S M A C G)

For FD (4): S,C,M->G, we decompose S6 to

S7 = (S C M G)

```
S8 = (S C M A)

For FD (6): A->M, we decompose S8 to S9 = (A M)
S10 = (S C A)
```

Note that FD (5) cannot be applied to any final decomposed relation, so the decomposition is done. FD (5): S,M->A is not preserved. So the final decomposition of StudentInfo is:

```
1. S1 = (S N)

2. S3 = (I L)

3. S5 = (C T I)

4. S7 = (S C M G)

5. S9 = (A M)

6. S10 = (S C A)
```

4 Obtain a lossless-join, dependency-preserving, 3NF decomposition of StudentInfo by making use of the BCNF decomposition in Question (c).

```
The BCNF decomposition we obtained from (c) does not preserve FD (5): S,M->A, so we add S11 = (S M A).

So the final 3NF decomposition is:
S1 = (S N), S3 = (I L), S5 = (C T I), S7 = (S C M G), S9 = (A M), S10 = (S C A), S11 = (S M A)

Since S9 C S11, we can drop S9. So the final decomposition is:
1. S1 = (S N)
2. S3 = (I L)
3. S5 = (C T I)
4. S7 = (S C M G)
5. S10 = (S C A)
6. S11 = (S M A)
```

5 Obtain a lossless-join, dependency-preserving, 3NF decomposition of StudentInfo via synthesis by making use of your minimal cover in Question (b).

```
The minimum cover is S->N, C->T, C->I, I->L, SCM->G, SM->A, A-M. The relations obtained from a minimum cover set is: R1 = (S N), R2 = (C T), R3 = (C I), R4 = (I L), R5 = (S C M G), R6 = (S M A), R7 = (A M)
```

Check if any relation contains a key to the original relation: R5 = (S C M G) contains key (S C M), so it is a lossless-join decomposition.

Since $R7 \subset R6$, we can drop R7. Since R2 and R3 share the same key C, we can merge them to R23 = (C T I).

So the final decomposition is:

- 1. R1 = (S N)
- 2. R23 = (C T I)
- 3. R4 = (I L)
- 4. R5 = (S C M G)
- 5. R6 = (S M A)

6 Comment on the differences, if any, between your answers to Questions (d) and (e).

The decomposition obtained from (d) has one extra relation R = (S C A) comparing to the decomposition obtained from (e).

So the synthesis approach usually results in fewer number of tables (less redundancy) than the BCNF decomposition approach to 3NF.