Overview - detailed

- DB design and normalization
  - pitfalls of bad design
  - decomposition
  - normal forms

Goal

- Design ‘good’ tables
  - sub-goal#1: define what ‘good’ means
  - sub-goal#2: fix ‘bad’ tables
- in short: “we want tables where the attributes depend on the primary key, on the whole key, and nothing but the key”
- Let’s see why, and how:
Pitfalls

takes1 (ssn, c-id, grade, name, address)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ssn</th>
<th>c-id</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Bad' - why? because: ssn->address, name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ssn</th>
<th>c-id</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>smith</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pitfalls

- Redundancy
  - space
  - (inconsistencies)
  - insertion/deletion anomalies:
Pitfalls

- insertion anomaly:
  “jones” registers, but takes no class - no place to store his address!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>123</th>
<th>413</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Smith</th>
<th>Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pitfalls

- deletion anomaly:
  delete the last record of ‘smith’ (we lose his address!)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>123</th>
<th>413</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Smith</th>
<th>Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Solution: decomposition

- split offending table in two (or more), eg.:
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Decompositions

There are ‘bad’ decompositions. Good ones are:
• lossless and
• dependency preserving

Decompositions - lossy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1(ssn, grade, name, address)</th>
<th>R2(c-id, grade)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ssn, grade, name, address</td>
<td>c-id, grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123  A  white main</td>
<td>213  A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123  B  white main</td>
<td>213  B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234  A  jones_toolbar</td>
<td>213  A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ssn -> name, address
ssn, c-id -> grade
Decompositions - lossy:
can not recover original table with a join!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ssn</th>
<th>c-id</th>
<th>grade</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decompositions
example of non-dependency preserving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Pitta</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Pitta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Pitta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decompositions
(drill: is it lossless?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Pitta</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Pitta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decompositions - lossless

Definition:
consider schema R, with FD ‘F’. R1, R2 is a lossless join decomposition of R if we always have: \( r_1 \bowtie r_2 = r \)

An easier criterion?

Decomposition - lossless

Theorem: lossless join decomposition if the joining attribute is a superkey in at least one of the new tables

Formally:

\[
R_1 \cap R_2 \rightarrow R_1 \text{ or } R_1 \cap R_2 \rightarrow R_2
\]

Decomposition - lossless

example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ssn</th>
<th>c-id</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ssn</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Forbes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{ssn, c-id} \rightarrow \text{grade} \\
\text{ssn} \rightarrow \text{name, address} \\
\text{ssn, c-id} \rightarrow \text{grade}
\]
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Decomposition - depend. pres.
informally: we don’t want the original FDs to span two tables - counter-example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Pitts.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Pitts.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S# -> address, status
address -> status

Decomposition - depend. pres.
dependency preserving decomposition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Pitts.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S#</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Pitts.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S# -> address, status
address -> status
(but: S#->status ?)
Decomposition - depend. pres.

informally: we don’t want the original FDs to span two tables.
More specifically: … the FDs of the canonical cover.

why is dependency preservation good?

A: eg., record that ‘Philly’ has status ‘A’
Decomposition - conclusions

- decompositions should always be lossless
  - joining attribute -> superkey
- whenever possible, we want them to be dependency preserving (occasionally, impossible - see ‘STJ’ example later…)
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Normal forms - BCNF

We saw how to fix ‘bad’ schemas - but what is a ‘good’ schema?

Answer: ‘good’, if it obeys a ‘normal form’, ie., a set of rules.

Typically: Boyce-Codd Normal form
Normal forms - BCNF

Defn.: Rel. R is in BCNF wrt F, if
• informally: everything depends on the full key, and nothing but the key
• semi-formally: every determinant (of the cover) is a candidate key

Normal forms - BCNF

Example and counter-example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ssn</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Shady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Forbes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ssn</th>
<th>Id</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Forbes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normal forms - BCNF

Formally: for every FD $a \rightarrow b$ in F
– $a \rightarrow b$ is trivial ($a$ superset of $b$) or
– $a$ is a superkey
Normal forms - BCNF

Theorem: given a schema R and a set of FD ‘F’, we can always decompose it to schemas R1, … Rn, so that
– R1, … Rn are in BCNF and
– the decompositions are lossless.
(but, some decomp. might lose dependencies)

- for every FD X->A that violates BCNF, decompose to tables (X,A) and (R-A)
- repeat recursively
eg. TAKES1(ssn, c-id, grade, name, address)
   ssn -> name, address
   ssn, c-id -> grade
Normal forms - BCNF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ssn, c-id</th>
<th>Grade, Name, Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123 413 A</td>
<td>A, Joe Smith, Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 415 B</td>
<td>B, Smith Main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 211 A</td>
<td>A, Jones Forbes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ssn->name, address, c-id -> grade

Normal forms - BCNF

pictorially: we want a ‘star’ shape

 Normal forms - BCNF

pictorially: we want a ‘star’ shape

Normal forms - BCNF

pictorially: we want a ‘star’ shape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Normal forms - BCNF

or a star-like: (eg., 2 cand. keys):
STUDENT(ssn, st#, name, address)

name

address

ssn

st#


name

address

ssn

st#
Normal forms - 3NF

STJ( Student, Teacher, subJect)
T-> J    S,J -> T

How to decompose it to BCNF?

1) R1(T,J)   R2(S,J)
   (BCNF? - lossless? - dep. pres.? )
2) R1(T,J)   R2(S,T)
   (BCNF? - lossless? - dep. pres.? )

Normal forms - 3NF

STJ( Student, Teacher, subJect)
T-> J    S,J -> T

1) R1(T,J)   R2(S,J)
   (BCNF? Y+Y - lossless? N - dep. pres.? N )
2) R1(T,J)   R2(S,T)
   (BCNF? Y+Y - lossless? Y - dep. pres.? N )
Normal forms - 3NF

STJ( Student, Teacher, Subject)

T-> J  S,J -> T

in this case: impossible to have both

• BCNF and
• dependency preservation

Welcome 3NF!

Informally, 3NF ‘forgives’ the red arrow in the can. cover

Formally, a rel. R with FDs ‘F’ is in 3NF if:
for every \( a->b \) in F:

• it is trivial or
• \( a \) is a superkey or
• \( b \): part of a candidate key
Normal forms - 3NF

how to bring a schema to 3NF?
two algo’s in book: First one:
• start from ER diagram and turn to tables
• then we have a set of tables R1, ... Rn which
  are in 3NF
• for each FD (X->A) in the cover that is not
  preserved, create a table (X,A)

Normal forms - 3NF

how to bring a schema to 3NF?
two algo’s in book: Second one (‘synthesis’)
• take all attributes of R
• for each FD (X->A) in the cover, add a table
  (X,A)
• if not lossless, add a table with appropriate
  key

Example:
R: ABC
F: A->B, C->B
Q1: what is the cover?
Q2: what is the decomposition to 3NF?
Normal forms - 3NF

Example:
R: ABC
F: A→B, C→B
Q1: what is the cover?
A1: ‘F’ is the cover
Q2: what is the decomposition to 3NF?
A2: R1(A,B), R2(C,B), ...

[is it lossless??]
Normal forms - 3NF vs BCNF

- If ‘R’ is in BCNF, it is always in 3NF (but not the reverse)
- In practice, aim for
  - BCNF; lossless join; and dep. preservation
- if impossible, we accept
  - 3NF; but insist on lossless join and dep. preservation

Normal forms - more details

- why ‘3’NF? what is 2NF? 1NF?
- 1NF: attributes are atomic (i.e., no set-valued attr., a.k.a. ‘repeating groups’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ssn</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dependants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Peter, Mary, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Ann, Michael</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normal forms - more details

2NF: 1NF and non-key attr. fully depend on the key
counter-example: TAKES1(ssn, c-id, grade, name, address)
ssn -> name, address  ssn, c-id -> grade
Normal forms - more details

• 3NF: 2NF and no transitive dependencies
  • counter-example:
    A
    ↓
    B
    ↓
    C

  in 2NF, but **not** in 3NF

Normal forms - more details

• 4NF, multivalued dependencies etc: IGNORE
• in practice, E-R diagrams usually lead to tables in BCNF

Overview - conclusions

DB design and normalization
  – pitfalls of bad design
  – decompositions (lossless, dep. preserving)
  – normal forms (BCNF or 3NF)

“everything should depend on the key, the whole key, and nothing but the key”