Databases
Lecture 7

Timothy G. Griffin

Computer Laboratory
University of Cambridge, UK

Databases, Lent 2009

Lecture 07: Decomposition to Normal Forms

Outline

- Attribute closure algorithm
- Schema decomposition methods
- Problems with obtaining both dependency preservation and lossless-join property

Closure

By soundness and completeness

$$\text{closure}(F,\ \mathbf{X}) = \{A \mid F \vdash \mathbf{X} \rightarrow A\} = \{A \mid \mathbf{X} \rightarrow A \in F^+\}$$

Claim 2 (from previous lecture)

$\mathbf{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{W} \in F^+$ if and only if $\mathbf{W} \subseteq \text{closure}(F,\ \mathbf{Y})$.

If we had an algorithm for closure(F, $\mathbf{X}$), then we would have a (brute force!) algorithm for enumerating F^+:

F^+

- for every subset $\mathbf{Y} \subseteq \text{atts}(F)$
  - for every subset $\mathbf{Z} \subseteq \text{closure}(F,\ \mathbf{Y})$,
    - output $\mathbf{Y} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$

Attribute Closure Algorithm

- Input : a set of FDs F and a set of attributes $\mathbf{X}$.
- Output : $\mathbf{Y} = \text{closure}(F,\ \mathbf{X})$

1. $\mathbf{Y} := \mathbf{X}$
2. while there is some $\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{T} \in F$ with $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \mathbf{Y}$ and $\mathbf{T} \not\subseteq \mathbf{Y}$, then $\mathbf{Y} := \mathbf{Y} \cup \mathbf{T}$.

An Example (UW1997, Exercise 3.6.1)

$R(A,\ B, C, D)$ with F made up of the FDs

$$A, B \rightarrow C$$
$$C \rightarrow D$$
$$D \rightarrow A$$

What is F^+?

Brute force!

Let's just consider all possible nonempty sets **X** — there are only 15...

Example (cont.)

$$F = \{A, B \rightarrow C,\ \ C \rightarrow D,\ \ D \rightarrow A\}$$

For the single attributes we have

- $\{A\}^+ = \{A\}$,
- $\{B\}^+ = \{B\}$,
- $\{C\}^+ = \{A,\ C,\ D\}$,
  - $\{C\} \stackrel{C \rightarrow D}{\Longrightarrow} \{C,\ D\} \stackrel{D \rightarrow A}{\Longrightarrow} \{A,\ C,\ D\}$
- $\{D\}^+ = \{A,\ D\}$
  - $\{D\} \stackrel{D \rightarrow A}{\Longrightarrow} \{A,\ D\}$

The only new dependency we get with a single attribute on the left is $C \rightarrow A$.

Example (cont.)

$$F = \{A, B \rightarrow C, \;\; C \rightarrow D, \;\; D \rightarrow A\}$$

Now consider pairs of attributes.

- $\{A, \; B\}^+ = \{A, \; B, \; C, \; D\}$,
  - so $A, B \rightarrow D$ is a new dependency
- $\{A, \; C\}^+ = \{A, \; C, \; D\}$,
  - so $A, C \rightarrow D$ is a new dependency
- $\{A, \; D\}^+ = \{A, \; D\}$,
  - so nothing new.
- $\{B, \; C\}^+ = \{A, \; B, \; C, \; D\}$,
  - so $B, C \rightarrow A, D$ is a new dependency
- $\{B, \; D\}^+ = \{A, \; B, \; C, \; D\}$,
  - so $B, D \rightarrow A, C$ is a new dependency
- $\{C, \; D\}^+ = \{A, \; C, \; D\}$,
  - so $C, D \rightarrow A$ is a new dependency

Example (cont.)

$$F = \{A, B \rightarrow C, \;\; C \rightarrow D, \;\; D \rightarrow A\}$$

For the triples of attributes:

- $\{A, \; C, \; D\}^+ = \{A, \; C, \; D\}$,
- $\{A, \; B, \; D\}^+ = \{A, \; B, \; C, \; D\}$,
  - so $A, B, D \rightarrow C$ is a new dependency
- $\{A, \; B, \; C\}^+ = \{A, \; B, \; C, \; D\}$,
  - so $A, B, C \rightarrow D$ is a new dependency
- $\{B, \; C, \; D\}^+ = \{A, \; B, \; C, \; D\}$,
  - so $B, C, D \rightarrow A$ is a new dependency

And since $\{A, \; B, \; C, \; D\}+ = \{A, \; B, \; C, \; D\}$, we get no new dependencies with four attributes.

Example (cont.)

We generated 11 new FDs:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} C & \rightarrow & A \\ A, C & \rightarrow & D \\ B, C & \rightarrow & D \\ B, D & \rightarrow & C \\ A, B, C & \rightarrow & D \\ B, C, D & \rightarrow & A \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{rcl} A, B & \rightarrow & D \\ B, C & \rightarrow & A \\ B, D & \rightarrow & A \\ C, D & \rightarrow & A \\ A, B, D & \rightarrow & C \end{array}$$

Can you see the Key?

$\{A, B\}$, $\{B, C\}$, and $\{B, D\}$ are keys.

Note: this schema is already in 3NF! Why?

General Decomposition Method (GDM)

GDM

1. Understand your FDs F (compute F^+),
2. find $R(\mathbf{X}) = R(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Y})$ (sets $\mathbf{Z}$, $\mathbf{W}$ and $\mathbf{Y}$ are disjoint) with FD $\mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W} \in F^+$ violating a condition of desired NF,
3. split R into two tables $R_1(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{W})$ and $R_2(\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{Y})$
4. wash, rinse, repeat

Reminder

For $\mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$, if we assume $\mathbf{Z} \cap \mathbf{W} = \{\}$, then the conditions are

1. $\mathbf{Z}$ is a superkey for R (2NF, 3NF, BCNF)
2. $\mathbf{W}$ is a subset of some key (2NF, 3NF)
3. $\mathbf{Z}$ is not a proper subset of any key (2NF)

The lossless-join condition is guaranteed by GDM

- This method will produce a lossless-join decomposition because of (repeated applications of) Heath's Rule!
- That is, each time we replace an S by S_1 and S_2, we will always be able to recover S as $S_1 \bowtie S_2$.
- Note that in GDM step 3, the FD $\mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}$ may represent a key constraint for R_1.

But does the method always terminate? Please think about this ....

Return to Example — Decompose to BCNF

$R(A, B, C, D)$

$$F = \{A, B \rightarrow C, \quad C \rightarrow D, \quad D \rightarrow A\}$$

Which FDs in F^+ violate BCNF?

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \rightarrow & A \\ C & \rightarrow & D \\ D & \rightarrow & A \\ A, C & \rightarrow & D \\ C, D & \rightarrow & A \end{array}$$

Return to Example — Decompose to BCNF

Decompose $R(A,\ B, C, D)$ to BCNF

Use $C \rightarrow D$ to obtain

- $R_1(C,\ D)$. This is in BCNF. Done.
- $R_2(A,\ B,\ C)$ This is not in BCNF. Why? A, B and B, C are the only keys, and $C \rightarrow A$ is a FD for R_1. So use $C \rightarrow A$ to obtain
  - $R_{2.1}(A,\ C)$. This is in BCNF. Done.
  - $R_{2.2}(B,\ C)$. This is in BCNF. Done.

Exercise : Try starting with any of the other BCNF violations and see where you end up.

The GDM does not always preserve dependencies!

$R(A,\ B,\ C,\ D,\ E)$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} A, B & \rightarrow & C \\ D, E & \rightarrow & C \\ B & \rightarrow & D \end{array}$$

- $\{A,\ B\}^+ = \{A,\ B,\ C,\ D\}$,
- so $A, B \rightarrow C, D$,
- and $\{A,\ B,\ E\}$ is a key.

- $\{B,\ E\}^+ = \{B,\ C,\ D,\ E\}$,
- so $B, E \rightarrow C, D$,
- and $\{A,\ B,\ E\}$ is a key (again)

Let's try for a BCNF decomposition ...

Decomposition 1

Decompose $R(A, B, C, D, E)$ using $A, B \rightarrow C, D$:

- $R_1(A, B, C, D)$. Decompose this using $B \rightarrow D$:
  - $R_{1.1}(B, D)$. Done.
  - $R_{1.2}(A, B, C)$. Done.
- $R_2(A, B, E)$. Done.

But in this decomposition, how will we enforce this dependency?

$$D, E \rightarrow C$$

Decomposition 2

Decompose $R(A, B, C, D, E)$ using $B, E \rightarrow C, D$:

- $R_3(B, C, D, E)$. Decompose this using $D, E \rightarrow C$
  - $R_{3.1}(C, D, E)$. Done.
  - $R_{3.2}(B, D, E)$. Decompose this using $B \rightarrow D$:
    - $R_{3.2.1}(B, D)$. Done.
    - $R_{3.2.2}(B, E)$. Done.
- $R_4(A, B, E)$. Done.

But in this decomposition, how will we enforce this dependency?

$$A, B \rightarrow C$$

Summary

- It always is possible to obtain BCNF that has the lossless-join property (using GDM)
  - But the result may not preserve all dependencies.
- It is always possible to obtain 3NF that preserves dependencies and has the lossless-join property.
  - Using methods based on “minimal covers” (for example, see EN2000).