

CS 4604: Introduction to Database Management Systems

B. Aditya Prakash

Lecture #16: 3NF

Preserving FDs in a Decomposition

- Consider the relation
 - Teach(CourseNumber, DepartmentName, Professor, Semester, Year)
- The relation models which courses a professor teaches in which semester
- Do not assume that each course is taught by at most one professor
- University introduces two new rules
 - Each professor teaches ≤ 1 course per semester
Professor Semester Year \rightarrow CourseNumber DepartmentName
 - Each course is taught either in the fall every year or in the spring every year
CourseNumber DepartmentName \rightarrow Semester
- What are the keys?
 - {Professor, Semester, Year}
 - {CourseNumber, DepartmentName, Professor, Year}

Preserving FDs in a Decomposition

- Decomposing using
CourseNumber DepartmentName \rightarrow Semester
 - Teach1 (CourseNumber, DepartmentName, Semester)
 - Teach2 (CourseNumber, DepartmentName, Professor, Year)
- Are both in BCNF?
- How do you enforce
Professor Semester Year \rightarrow CourseNumber DepartmentName?
 - Only by joining Teach1 and Teach2, which is expensive
- So BCNF is not necessarily dependency preserving!

“Elegant” Workaround

- Let’s define the problem away 😊

Third Normal Form

- A relation R is in Third Normal Form (3NF) iff for every non-trivial FD $A_1 A_2 \dots A_n \rightarrow B$ for R, one of the following two conditions is true:

– $A_1 A_2 \dots A_n$ is a superkey for R :::BCNF

– B is **prime** i.e. B is an attribute in some key for R

- Note B should be in a key not a superkey
- NP-Complete to test if a relation is in 3NF

Third Normal Form

- A relation R is in Third Normal Form (3NF) iff for every non-trivial FD $A_1 A_2 \dots A_n \rightarrow B$ for R , one of the following two conditions is true:
 - $A_1 A_2 \dots A_n$ is a superkey for R
 - B is **prime** i.e. B is an attribute in some key for R
- What happened to the first two? 😊
 - They were defined, but not very useful today

Third Normal Form

- Teach(C, D, P, S, Y) has FDs
 - $PSY \rightarrow CD$
 - $CD \rightarrow S$
- Keys are $\{P, S, Y\}$ and $\{C, D, P, Y\}$
- $CD \rightarrow S$ violates BCNF
- However, Teach is in 3NF because S is part of a key

More 3NF Examples

- Consider the relation Teach(CourseNumber, DepartmentName, Professor, Semester, Year)
- The relation models which courses a professor teaches in which semester

1. Each professor teaches ≤ 1 course per semester.

$P S Y \rightarrow C D$

2. In a year, each course is taught either in the fall or in the spring.
The semester a course is taught can change from year to year.

$C D Y \rightarrow S$

- Keys?
 - $\{P, S, Y\}$ and $\{C, D, P, Y\}$
- In 3NF?
 - Yes

More 3NF Examples

- Consider the relation Teach(CourseNumber, DepartmentName, Professor, Semester, Year)
- The relation models which courses a professor teaches in which semester
 1. Each professor teaches ≤ 1 course per semester.

$P S Y \rightarrow C D$

2. In a year, each course is taught either in the fall or in the spring. The semester a course is taught can change from year to year.

$C D Y \rightarrow S$

3. Every time it is offered, each course is taught by at most one professor

$C D Y S \rightarrow P$

- Keys?
 - $\{P, S, Y\}$ and $\{C, D, Y, P\}$ and $\{C, D, Y, S\}$
- In 3NF?
 - Yes

More 3NF Examples

- Consider the relation Teach(CourseNumber, DepartmentName, Professor, Semester, Year)
- The relation models which courses a professor teaches in which semester
 1. Each professor teaches ≤ 1 course per semester.

$P S Y \rightarrow C D$

2. In a year, each course is taught either in the fall or in the spring. The semester a course is taught can change from year to year.

$C D Y \rightarrow S$

3. Over all offerings, each course is taught by at most one professor.

$C D \rightarrow P$

- Keys?
 - $\{P, S, Y\}$ and $\{C, D, Y\}$
- In 3NF?
 - Still Yes!

Decomposition into 3NF

- We can always decompose a relational schema R into a set S of schemas that are dependency-preserving, i.e.
 - each relation in S is in 3NF
 - the decomposition of R into S is lossless-join
 - the decomposition into S is dependency-preserving, i.e., for each FD that holds in R , there is a relation in S that allows that FD to be checked
- Then why bother with BCNF?
 - Unfortunately, can't guarantee no anomalies above!

3NF Synthesis Algorithm

- Let F be the set of all FDs of R
 - We will compute a lossless-join, dependency-preserving decomposition of R into S , where every relation in S is in 3NF
1. Find a minimal basis for F , say G
 2. For every FD $X \rightarrow A$ in G , use $X \cup A$ as the schema for one of the relations in S
 3. If the attributes in none of the relations in S form a superkey for R , add another relation to S whose schema is a key for R

Computing a Minimal Basis

- See step 3 of Algorithm 3.12 on page 82 of your textbook
- Start with a set F of FDs and compute a minimal basis G
 1. If there is an FD D in F that follows from the other FDs in F , remove D from F
 2. Let $Y \rightarrow B$ be an FD in F with at least two attributes in Y and let Z be Y with one of its attributes removed. If $Z \rightarrow B$ follows from the FDs in F , replace $Y \rightarrow B$ by $Z \rightarrow B$
 3. Repeat the first two steps until no more changes can be made to F

3NF Synthesis Algorithm

Surprisingly
Polynomial!

- Let F be the set of all FDs of R
- We will compute a lossless-join, dependency-preserving decomposition of R into S , where every relation in S is in 3NF
 1. Find a minimal basis for F , say G
 2. For every FD $X \rightarrow A$ in G , use $X \cup A$ as the schema for one of the relations in S
 3. If the attributes in none of the relations in S form a superkey for R , add another relation to S whose schema is a key for R

3NF Synthesis Algorithm

Correctness?
(Tricky Proof)

- Let F be the set of all FDs of R
- We will compute a lossless-join, dependency-preserving decomposition of R into S , where every relation in S is in 3NF
 1. Find a minimal basis for F , say G
 2. For every FD $X \rightarrow A$ in G , use $X \cup A$ as the schema for one of the relations in S
 3. If the attributes in none of the relations in S form a superkey for R , add another relation to S whose schema is a key for R

Example

- Example:

$R(A, B, C)$

$F: \{A \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow B\}$

- Q1: what is the cover?
- Q2: what is the decomposition to 3NF?

Example

- Example:

$R(A, B, C)$

$F: \{A \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow B\}$

- Q1: what is the cover?

A1: 'F' is the cover

- Q2: what is the decomposition to 3NF?

A2: $R_1(A, B), R_2(C, B), \dots$ [is it lossless??]

Example

- Example:

$R(A, B, C)$

$F: \{A \rightarrow B, C \rightarrow B\}$

- Q1: what is the cover?

A1: 'F' is the cover

- Q2: what is the decomposition to 3NF?

A2: $R_1(A, B), R_2(C, B), R_3(A, C)$

Next Lecture

- Multivalued Dependencies
- 4NF