Kapitel 3: Formal Design

- We want to distinguish good from bad database design.
- What kind of additional information do we need?
- Can we transform a bad into a good design?
- By which cost?

3.1 Motivation

Relations and anomalies

Stadt

SNr	SName	LCode	LFläche
7	Freiburg	D	357
9	Berlin	D	357
40	Moscow	RU	17075
43	St.Petersburg	RU	17075

Kontinent

KName	LCode	KFläche	Prozent
Europe	D	3234	100
Europe	RU	3234	20
Asia	RU	44400	80

Having removed anomalies

Stadt'

SNr	SName	LCode
7	Freiburg	D
9	Berlin	D
40	Moscow	RU
43	St.Petersburg	RU

Land'

LCode	LFläche
D	357
RU	17075

Lage'

LCode	KName	Prozent
D	Europe	100
RU	Europe	20
RU	Asia	80

Kontinent'

KName	KFläche
Europe	3234
Asia	44400

3.2 Functional Dependencies

3.2.1 Definition

- Let a relation schema be given by its format V and let $X, Y \subseteq V$.
- Let $r \in \mathrm{Rel}(V)$. r fulfills a *functional dependency (FD)* $X \rightarrow Y$, if for all $\mu, \nu \in r$:

$$\mu[X] = \nu[X] \Rightarrow \mu[Y] = \nu[Y].$$

- Let $\mathcal{F}$ a set of functional dependencies over V and $X, Y \subseteq V$. The set of all relations $r \in \mathrm{Rel}(V)$, which fulfill all FD's in $\mathcal{F}$, is called $\mathrm{Sat}(V, \mathcal{F})$.

3.2.2 Membership-Test

- The FD $X \rightarrow Y$, $\mathcal{F} \models X \rightarrow Y$ is implied by $\mathcal{F}$, if for each relation r, whenever $r \in \mathrm{Sat}(V, \mathcal{F})$ then r fulfills $X \rightarrow Y$.
- The set $\mathcal{F}^+ = \{X \rightarrow Y \mid \mathcal{F} \models X \rightarrow Y\}$ is called *closure* of $\mathcal{F}$.
- $X \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{F}^+$ is called *Membership-Test*.

key

Let $V = \{A_1, \ldots, A_n\}$. $X \subseteq V$ is called *key* of V (bzgl. $\mathcal{F}$), if

- $X \rightarrow A_1 \ldots A_n \in \mathcal{F}^+$,
- $Y \subset X \Rightarrow Y \rightarrow A_1 \ldots A_n \notin \mathcal{F}^+$.

Armstrong-Axiome

Let $r \in \mathsf{Sat}(V, \mathcal{F})$.

(A1) Reflexivität: If $Y \subseteq X \subseteq V$, then r fulfills FA $X \rightarrow Y$.

(A2) Augmentation: If $X \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{F}, Z \subseteq V$, then r fulfills FA $XZ \rightarrow YZ$.

(A3) Transitivity: If $X \rightarrow Y, Y \rightarrow Z \in \mathcal{F}$, then r fulfills FA $X \rightarrow Z$.

(A1): *trivial FD's*.

Correctness and Completeness

- Every FD derivable by the Armstrong axioms is an element of the closure (correctness).
- Every FD in $\mathcal{F}^+$ is derivable by the Armstrong axioms (completeness)
  - To show completeness: If $X \rightarrow Y$ not derivable by (A1)–(A3), then $X \rightarrow Y \notin \mathcal{F}^+$, i.e. $\exists r$, r fulfills $\mathcal{F}$, however does not $X \rightarrow Y$.

Membership-Test Variante 1:

Starting from $\mathcal{F}$ apply (A1)–(A3)until $X \rightarrow Y$ is derived, or $\mathcal{F}^+$ is derived and $X \rightarrow Y \notin \mathcal{F}^+$.

Complexity?

more axioms

Let $r \in \text{Sat}(V, \mathcal{F})$. Let $X, Y, Z, W \subseteq V$ und $A \in V$.

(A4) Union: If $X \to Y, X \to Z \in \mathcal{F}$, r fulfills FD $X \to YZ$.

(A5) Pseudotransitivity: If $X \to Y, WY \to Z \in \mathcal{F}$, r fulfills FD $XW \to Z$.

(A6) Decomposition: If $X \to Y \in \mathcal{F}, Z \subseteq Y$, r fulfills FD $X \to Z$.

(A7) Reflexivity: If $X \subseteq V$, r fulfills FD $X \to X$.

(A8) Accumulation: If $X \to YZ, Z \to AW \in \mathcal{F}$, r fullfills $X \to YZA$.

Axiom systems {(A1), (A2), (A3)} and {(A6), (A7), (A8)} are eqiuvalent.

Proof!

Membership-Test Variante 2:

- *(Attribut-)closure* X^+ of X (w.r.t. $\mathcal{F}$):

$$X^+ = \{A \;\; | \; A \in V \text{ and } X \rightarrow A \text{ is derivable by (A1)} - \text{(A3)}\}.$$

- First compute X^+ by (A6) - (A8) and afterwards test whether $Y \subseteq X^+$.

XPlus-Algorithm

```
XPlus(X, Y, F) boolean {
  result := X;
  WHILE (changes to result) DO
    FOR each X' → Y' ∈ F DO
       IF (X' ⊆ result) THEN result := result ∪ Y';
    end.
  IF (Y ⊆ result) RETURN true ELSE false;
}
```

Example XPlus-Algorithm

Let $V = \{A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I\}$ and
$\mathcal{F} = \{AB \rightarrow E, BE \rightarrow I, E \rightarrow G, GI \rightarrow H\}$.

$AB \rightarrow GH \in \mathcal{F}^+$?

Axiom	Anwendung	result
(A7)	$AB \rightarrow AB$	$\{A, B\}$
...	...	...

Using XPlus-Algorithm we can, given $V, \mathcal{F}$, compute a key.

How?

3.2.3 Minimal Cover

Eqivalence

- Let $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ sets of FD's.
- $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ are called *equivalent*, $\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{G}$, if $\mathcal{F}^+ = \mathcal{G}^+$.

Left and right reduction

- A set $\mathcal{F}$ of FD's is called *left-reduced*, if the following condition is fulfilled.

  If $X \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{F}, Z \subset X$, then $\mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{F} \setminus \{X \rightarrow Y\}) \cup \{Z \rightarrow Y\}$ not equivalent $\mathcal{F}$.

  left-reduction: replace $X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{F}$ by $Z \rightarrow Y$.
- It is called *right-reduced*, if $X \rightarrow Y \in \mathcal{F}, Z \subset Y$, then $\mathcal{F}' = (\mathcal{F} \setminus \{X \rightarrow Y\}) \cup \{X \rightarrow Z\}$ not equivalent $\mathcal{F}$.

  right-reduction: replace $X \rightarrow Y$ in $\mathcal{F}$ by $X \rightarrow Z$.

looking for possible reductions

- Let $X \rightarrow Y$ be a FD in $\mathcal{F}$ and let $Z \rightarrow Y$, where $Z \subset X$.
  We perform a left-reduction, if $\mathit{XPlus}(Z, Y, \mathcal{F})$ is `true`.
- Let $X \rightarrow Y$ a FD in $\mathcal{F}$ and let $X \rightarrow Z$, where $Z \subset Y$.
  We perform a right-reduction, if $\mathit{XPlus}(X, Y, \mathcal{F}')$ is `true`.

Theorem

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a set of FD's and $\mathcal{F}'$ be derived from $\mathcal{F}$ by left-, resp. right-reduction.

$\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{F}'$.

Example

- $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A, B \rightarrow C, A \rightarrow C, C \rightarrow A\}$.
  right-reduction?
- $\mathcal{F}_2 = \{AB \rightarrow C, A \rightarrow B, B \rightarrow A\}$.
  left-reduction?

minimal cover

$\mathcal{F}^{min}$ is a *minimal cover* of $\mathcal{F}$, if it is derived from $\mathcal{F}$ by the following steps:

- Perform all possible left-reductions.
- Perform all possible right-reductions.
- Delete all trivial FD's of the form $X \rightarrow \emptyset$.
- Compute the union of all FD's $X \rightarrow Y_1, \ldots, X \rightarrow Y_n$ to derive $X \rightarrow Y_1 \ldots Y_n$.

- A Minimal cover can be computed in polynomial time.

  How?
- $\mathcal{F}^{min}$ is not unique, in general.

  Why?

3.3 Decomposition

3.3.1 Lossless

Let $\rho = \{X_1, \ldots, X_k\}$ a *decomposition* of V, $\mathcal{F}$ a set of FD's.

- Let $r \in \text{Sat}(V, \mathcal{F})$ and let $r_i = \pi[X_i]r$, $1 \leq i \leq k$.

  ρ is called *lossless*, if for any $r \in \text{Sat}(V, \mathcal{F})$ there holds:

$$r = \pi[X_1]r \bowtie \ldots \bowtie \pi[X_k]r.$$

Example

- $V = \{A, B, C\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{A \to B, A \to C\})$.
- $r \in Sat(V, \mathcal{F})$:

$$r = \begin{array}{ccc} A & B & C \\ \hline a_1 & b_1 & c_1 \\ a_2 & b_1 & c_2 \end{array}$$

- $\rho_1 = \{AB, BC\}$ and $\rho_2 = \{AB, AC\}$.
- $r \qquad \pi[AB]r \bowtie \pi[BC]r$,
- $r \qquad \pi[AB]r \bowtie \pi[AC]r$.

Theorem

Let a format V and set $\mathcal{F}$ of FD's. Let $\rho = (X_1, X_2)$ be a decomposition of V.

ρ is lossless, iff

$$(X_1 \cap X_2) \to (X_1 \setminus X_2) \in \mathcal{F}^+, \text{oder } (X_1 \cap X_2) \to (X_2 \setminus X_1) \in \mathcal{F}^+.$$

3.3.2 Dependency Preserving

Example

$V = \{A, B, C, D\}$, $\rho = \{AB, BC\}$.

- $\mathcal{F} = \{A \to B, B \to C, C \to A\}$.

  Is ρ dependency preserving w.r.t. $\mathcal{F}$?

- Consider$\mathcal{F}' = \{A \to B, B \to C, C \to B, B \to A\}$.

  Is ρ dependency preserving w.r.t. $\mathcal{F}'$?

Definition

- Let $R = (V, \mathcal{F})$ and $Z \subseteq V$.
- Define the *projection* of $\mathcal{F}$ on Z

$$\pi[Z]\mathcal{F} = \{X \to Y \in \mathcal{F}^+ \mid XY \subseteq Z\}.$$

- A decomposition $\rho = \{X_1, \ldots, X_k\}$ of V is called *dependency preserving* w.r.t. $\mathcal{F}$, if

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \pi[X_i]\mathcal{F} \equiv \mathcal{F}.$$

There exist lossless decompositions which are not dependency preserving!

- $R = (V, \mathcal{F})$, wobei $V = \{\texttt{Stadt, Adresse, PLZ}\}$,
- $\mathcal{F} = \{\texttt{Stadt Adresse} \rightarrow \texttt{PLZ}, \texttt{PLZ} \rightarrow \texttt{Stadt}\}$.
- $\rho = \{X_1, X_2\}$: $X_1 = \{\texttt{Adresse, PLZ}\}$ und $X_2 = \{\texttt{Stadt, PLZ}\}$.
- ρ is lossless, as $(X_1 \cap X_2) \rightarrow (X_2 \setminus X_1) \in \mathcal{F}$.
- ρ is not dependency preserving.

What are the keys!

3.4 Normalform

Let $R = (V, \mathcal{F})$. We are looking for a decomposition $\rho = (X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ of R with the following properties:

- each $R_i = (X_i, \pi[X_i]\mathcal{F})$, $1 \leq i \leq k$ is in normalform,
- ρ is lossless and, if possible, dependency preserving.
- k minimal.

Terminology

- Let X key of R and $X \subseteq Y \subseteq V$, then Y *Superkey* of R.
- If $A \in X$ for any key X of R, then A *Keyattribute (KA)* of R;
- if $A \notin X$ for any key X, then A *Non-Keyattribute (NKA)*.

3rd Normalform

Schema $R = (V, \mathcal{F})$ is in *3rd Normalform* (3NF), if any NKA $A \in V$ fulfills:

If $X \rightarrow A \in \mathcal{F}$, $A \notin X$, then X Superkey.

3NF?

Stadt

SNr	SName	LCode	LFläche
7	Freiburg	D	357
9	Berlin	D	357
40	Moscow	RU	17075
43	St.Petersburg	RU	17075

Kontinent

KName	LCode	KFläche	Prozent
Europe	D	3234	100
Europe	RU	3234	20
Asia	RU	44400	80

3NF?

Stadt'

SNr	SName	LCode
7	Freiburg	D
9	Berlin	D
40	Moscow	RU
43	St.Petersburg	RU

Land'

LCode	LFläche
D	357
RU	17075

Lage'

LCode	KName	Prozent
D	Europe	100
RU	Europe	20
RU	Asia	80

Kontinent'

KName	KFläche
Europe	3234
Asia	44400

Boyce-Codd-Normalform

Schema $R = (V, \mathcal{F})$ is in *Boyce-Codd-Normalform* (BCNF), if the following holds. If $X \rightarrow A \in \mathcal{F}$, $A \notin X$, then X superkey.

BCNF implies 3NF.

- Consider $R = (V, \mathcal{F})$, where $V = \{$ `Stadt`, `Adresse`, `PLZ` $\}$, and $\mathcal{F} = \{$ `Stadt Adresse` $\rightarrow$ `PLZ`, `PLZ` $\rightarrow$ `Stadt`$\}$.
- R is in 3NF, however not in BCNF.
- Let $\rho = \{$`Adresse PLZ`, `Stadt PLZ`$\}$ a decomposizion, then ρ is in BCNF, lossless and not dependency preserving.

3.5 Normalization Algorithm

BCNF-Analysis: lossless and not dependency-preserving

Let $R = (V, \mathcal{F})$ a schema.

1. Let $X \subset V$, $A \in V$ and $X \to A \in \mathcal{F}$ a FD, which violates BCNF. Let $V' = V \setminus \{A\}$.

   Decompose R in

   $$R_1 = (V', \pi[V']\mathcal{F}), \quad R_2 = (XA, \pi[XA]\mathcal{F}).$$

2. Test for BCNF w.r.t. R_1 and R_2 and proceed recursively.

3NF-Analysis: lossless and dependency-preserving

Let $R = (V, \mathcal{F})$ a schema and let $\rho = (X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ a decomposition of V, such that the Schemata $R_1 = (X_1, \pi[X_1]\mathcal{F})$, ..., $R_k = (X_k, \pi[X_k]\mathcal{F})$ in BCNF.

1. Let $\mathcal{F}^{min}$ a minimal cover of $\mathcal{F}$.
2. Identify the set $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}^{min}$ of those FD's, which are not dependency preserving.
3. For any such FA, $X \rightarrow A$ extend ρ by XA, resp. schema $(XA, \pi[XA]\mathcal{F})$.