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## Overview



## A Design Challenge

There are a variety of ways that we can design relational schema - there is a space for improvement.

- Problem. we are trying to combine too much into one relation $\rightarrow$ maintenance problems called anomaly.
- Problem. we are trying to create to many relations $\rightarrow$ difficult to answer queries or retrieve the data
How do we identify such design problem and make improvements? - a design trade-off must be made.
- A well developed theory - dependencies and normalization
- Normalization - the process of converting a relation into a normal form.
- The process usually consists of decomposing a table into two or more tables with fewer attributes
- When normalizing relations, we are generally sacrificing retrieval speed to prevent data maintenance problems - a trade-off
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## Normalization

- Redundancy in the database may lead to anomalies.
- The normalization is a technique to reduce redundancy.
- It is a decomposition process to split tables up, so that the relation is in a normal form.
- The splitting is performed carefully so that no information is lost
- There different level of normal forms, the higher the normal form is, the lower the redundancy.


## Normal Forms

Normal forms build on each other

- First Normal Form (1NF)
- Second Normal Form (2NF)
- Third Normal Form (3NF)
- Boyce-Codd Normal Form (BCNF)
- Fourth Norm Form (4NF) - not to discuss, on your own
- Fifth Norm Form (5NF/PJNF) - not to discuss, on your own

- N. Domain-Key Normal Form (DKNF)
- not to discuss, on your own

Note that a relation in a higher normal form is always in a lower normal (observe the Venn diagram).
We limit the discussion to 1NF - BCNF.

## First Normal Form (1NF)

1NF: A relation R is in first normal form (1NF) if and only if all underlying domains contain atomic values only

What does this mean?

- No duplicate rows - Each table has a key: minimal set of attributes which can uniquely identify a record
- No multi-value attributes allowed - The values in each column of a table are atomic, i.e., no table of tables.
- There are no repeating groups - two columns do not store similar information in the same table.


## Example 1: 1 NF or not?

| EMPLID | Name | Course | Grades |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Sasha | CISC3810 | A |
| 1112223333 | Sasha | CISC3810 | A |

## Example 1: 1NF or not?

| EMPLID | Name | Course | Grades |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Sasha | CISC3810 | A |
| 1112223333 | Sasha | CISC3810 | A |

- Not in 1NF! Because it violates
- No duplicate rows - Each table has a key: minimal set of attributes which can uniquely identify a record


## Example 2: 1NF or not?

| EMPLID | Name | Grades | Courses |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Sasha | A,B | CISC3115,CISC3810 |
| 1112224444 | John | B,A | CISC3171,CISC3810 |

## Example 2: 1NF or not?

| EMPLID | Name | Grades | Courses |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Sasha | A,B | CISC3115,CISC3810 |
| 1112224444 | John | B,A | CISC3171,CISC3810 |

- Not in 1NF! It violates,
- No multi-value attributes allowed - The values in each column of a table are atomic, i.e., no table of tables.


## Example 3: 1NF or Not

| EMPLID | Name | Course1 | Course2 | Grade1 | Grade2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Sasha | CISC3115 | CISC3810 | A | B |
| 1112224444 | John | CISC3171 | CISC3810 | B | A |

## Example 3: 1NF or Not

| EMPLID | Name | Course1 | Course2 | Grade1 | Grade2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Sasha | CISC3115 | CISC3810 | A | B |
| 1112224444 | John | CISC3171 | CISC3810 | B | A |

- Not in 1NF! It violates,
- There are no repeating groups - two columns do not store similar information in the same table.


## Issues with Relations not in 1NF

What issues could there be with regard to the relations not in 1NF?
Can these happen and under what scenario?

- Insertion anomaly
- Deletion anomaly
- Update anomaly


## Issues with Relations in 1NF

Is the following relation in 1NF?

| InvNo | InvDate | CustNo | CustName | ItemNo | ItemName | ItemPrice | Qty |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1001 | $04 / 04 / 22$ | 212 | Will | 1 | Screw | 199 | 5 |
| 1001 | $04 / 04 / 22$ | 212 | Will | 3 | Bolt | 399 | 5 |
| 1001 | $04 / 04 / 22$ | 212 | Will | 5 | Washer | 99 | 9 |
| 1002 | $04 / 11 / 22$ | 225 | Chris | 1 | Screw | 199 | 10 |
| 1002 | $04 / 11 / 22$ | 225 | Chris | 2 | Nut | 499 | 6 |
| 1003 | $04 / 11 / 22$ | 240 | Lee | 1 | Screw | 199 | 4 |
| 1003 | $04 / 11 / 22$ | 240 | Lee | 2 | Nut | 499 | 3 |
| 1004 | $04 / 12 / 22$ | 218 | Latasha | 4 | Hammer | 999 | 8 |

- Does it have redundant data?
- What FDs hold?
- What are super keys and keys?
- What anomalies may occur?


## Issues with Relations in 1NF

- A table in 1NF may have redundant data.
- A table in 1NF does not show data consistency and integrity in the long run due to the anomalies.


## Second Normal Form (2NF)

2NF: A relation R is in second normal form (2NF) if and only if it is in 1 NF and every non-key attribute is fully dependent on the key

What does this mean?

- All requirements for 1NF must be met.
- FD holds: key $\rightarrow$ non-key attributes
- FD should not holds: part of key $\rightarrow$ part of non-key attributes


## Example: 1NF, 2NF, or Neither?

| EMPLID | Name | Course\# | CourseName | Credit | Grade |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Amy | CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 | A |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 3115 | Java II | 4 | A |

## Example: 1NF, 2NF, or Neither?

| EMPLID | Name | Course \# | CourseName | Credit | Grade |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Amy | CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 | A |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 | B |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 3115 | Java II | 4 | A |

- 1NF but not $2 N F$. Why?


## Example: 1NF, 2NF, or Neither?

| EMPLID | Name | Course \# | CourseName | Credit | Grade |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Amy | CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 | A |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 | B |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 3115 | Java II | 4 | A |

- 1NF but not 2NF. Why?
- Key: \{EMPLID, Course\#\}, which means, $\{$ EMPLID, Course\# $\} \rightarrow\{$ Name, CourseName, Credit $\}$
- FD holds, but it should not

Course $\# \rightarrow\{$ CourseName, Credit $\}$ since $\{$ Course\# $\} \subset\{E M P L I D$, Course\# $\}$ and $\{$ CourseName, Credit $\} \subset\{$ Name, CourseName, Credit, Grade $\}:$

## Normalizing 1NF to 2NF

Convert 1NF to 2NF

- Redundant data across multiple rows of a table must be moved to a separate table.
- The resulting tables must be related to each other by use of foreign key.


## Example: Normalizing 1NF to 2NF

| EMPLID | Name | Course\# | CourseName | Credit | Grade |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Amy | CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 | A |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 | B |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 3115 | Java II | 4 | A |


| EMPLID | Name | Course\# | Grade |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Amy | CISC 1115 | A |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 1115 | B |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 3115 | A |


| Course\# | CourseName | Credit |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 |
| CISC 3115 | Java II | 4 |

## Example: Normalizing 1NF to 2NF

Is there any additional way to normalize the following relation in 1NF to those in 2NF?

| EMPLID | Name | Course\# | CourseName | Credit | Grade |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1112223333 | Amy | CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 | A |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 1115 | Java I | 5 | B |
| 1112223334 | Latasha | CISC 3115 | Java II | 4 | A |

## Summary

| Normal Form | Characteristics |
| :--- | :--- |
| $1 N F$ | simple table, no repeating groups, and PK identified |
| $2 N F$ | $1 N F$ and no partial dependencies |

## Issues with Relations in 2NF

Is the following relation in 2NF? The relation is about invoices and customers of a business. The business assigns invoice number uniquely and each customer gets a unique customer number.

| InvNo | InvDate | CustNo | CustName |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1001 | $04 / 02 / 22$ | 212 | Will |
| 1002 | $04 / 03 / 22$ | 233 | Amy |
| 1003 | $04 / 03 / 22$ | 244 | Lee |
| 1004 | $04 / 04 / 22$ | 285 | Emma |

- Does it have redundant data?
- What FDs hold?
- What are super keys and keys?
- What anomalies may occur?


## Issues with Relations in 2NF

Is the following relation in 2NF? The relation is about invoices and customers of a business. The business assigns invoice number uniquely and each customer gets a unique customer number.

| InvNo | InvDate | CustNo | CustName |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1001 | $04 / 02 / 22$ | 212 | Will |
| 1002 | $04 / 03 / 22$ | 233 | Amy |
| 1003 | $04 / 03 / 22$ | 244 | Lee |
| 1004 | $04 / 04 / 22$ | 285 | Emma |

2NF: key is InvNo; although CustNo $\rightarrow$ CustName, $\{$ CustNo $\not \subset \not \subset\{$ InvNo $\}$

- The following FDs holds among the others: InvNo $\rightarrow$ CustNo and CustNo $\rightarrow$ CustName
- Update anomaly: updating CustNo but forgetting to update CustName will cause inconsistency


## Issues with Relations in 2NF

A relation in 2NF may satisfy the following property,

- transitive dependency: C is transitively dependent on A if there exists B such that: $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$.

As a result, update/delete anomaly may occur when some attribute is transitively depends on the key.

## Third Normal Form (3NF)

A relation R is in third normal form (3NF) if and only if it is in 2NF and every non-key attribute is non-transitively dependent on the key.

What does this mean?

- All requirements for 2nd NF must be met.
- Given key K , there does not exist $A$ and $B$ where $K \neq A, K \neq B$, and $A \neq B$ such that $K \rightarrow A$ and $A \rightarrow B$


## Normalizing 2NF to 3NF

Convert 2NF to 3NF

- Eliminate fields that transitively depend on the key;
- that is, any field that is dependent not only on the key but also on another non-key field must be moved to another table.
- The resulting tables must be related to each other by use of foreign key.


## Example: Normalizing 2NF to 3NF

| InvNo | InvDate | CustNo | CustName |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1001 | $04 / 02 / 22$ | 212 | Will |
| 1002 | $04 / 03 / 22$ | 233 | Amy |
| 1003 | $04 / 03 / 22$ | 244 | Lee |
| 1004 | $04 / 04 / 22$ | 285 | Emma |



| InvNo | InvDate | CustNo |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1001 | $04 / 02 / 22$ | 212 |
| 1002 | $04 / 03 / 22$ | 233 |
| 1003 | $04 / 03 / 22$ | 244 |
| 1004 | $04 / 04 / 22$ | 285 |


| CustNo | CustName |
| :--- | :--- |
| 212 | Will |
| 233 | Amy |
| 244 | Lee |
| 285 | Emma |

## Summary

| Normal Form | Characteristics |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1NF | simple table, no repeating groups, and PK identified |
| 2NF | 1NF and no partial dependencies |
| 3NF | 2NF and no transitive dependencies |

## Issues with Relations in 3NF

Consider a database for scheduling college classes and we have a relation as follows,

| Building | Room | StartTime | EndTime | Instructor |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IH | 1121 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Amy |
| IH | 1121 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | Will |
| IA | 325 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | John |
| IA | 325 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Will |

Is this relation in 3NF?

## Issues with Relations in 3NF

Consider a database for scheduling college classes and we have a relation as follows,

| Building | Room | StartTime | EndTime | Instructor |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IH | 1121 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Amy |
| IH | 1121 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | Will |
| IA | 325 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | John |
| IA | 325 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Will |

Is this relation in 3NF?
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## Issues with Relations in 3NF

Consider a database for scheduling college classes and we have a relation as follows,

| Building | Room | StartTime | EndTime | Instructor |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IH | 1121 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Amy |
| IH | 1121 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | Will |
| IA | 325 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | John |
| IA | 325 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Will |

Is this relation in 1NF?

- No duplicate rows - keys?
- Building, Room, StartTime (why?)
- Building, Room, EndTime (why?)
- StartTime, Instructor (why?)
- EndTime, Instructor (why?)
- Similar columns (no multi-valued attributes)?
- No repeating groups?


## Issues with Relations in 3NF

Consider a database for scheduling college classes and we have a relation as follows,

| Building | Room | StartTime | EndTime | Instructor |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IH | 1121 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Amy |
| IH | 1121 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | Will |
| IA | 325 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | John |
| IA | 325 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Will |

Is this relation in 2NF?

- No partial dependencies? The following FD's are not partial FD's because the determinants (left-hand-sides) are keys and there does not exist a non-trivial FD whose determinant is a proper subset of the determinants and the determinant functionally determines a non-key attribute.
- Building, Room, StartTime $\rightarrow$ Building, Room, StartTime, EndTime, Instructor
- Building, Room, EndTime $\rightarrow$ Building, Room, StartTime, EndTime, Instructor
- StartTime, Instructor $\rightarrow$ Building, Room, StartTime, EndTime, Instructor
- EndTime, Instructor $\rightarrow$ Building, Room, StartTime, EndTime, Instructor


## Issues with Relations in 3NF

Consider a database for scheduling college classes and we have a relation as follows,

| Building | Room | StartTime | EndTime | Instructor |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IH | 1121 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Amy |
| IH | 1121 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | Will |
| IA | 325 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | John |
| IA | 325 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Will |

Is this relation in 3NF?

- transitive dependency? - Is there is a non-key attribute that depends on something other than a key?


## Issues with Relations in 3NF

Consider a database for scheduling college classes and we have a reliation as follows,

| Building | Room | StartTime | EndTime | Instructor |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IH | 1121 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Amy |
| IH | 1121 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | Will |
| IA | 325 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | John |
| IA | 325 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Will |

Is this relation in 3NF?

- Although the following FD's exist, Instructor is not a key and the right-hand-sides are part of keys - there does not exist a transitive FD.
- Instructor $\rightarrow$ \{Building, Room, StartTime $\}$
- Instructor $\rightarrow$ \{Building, Room, EndTime\}


## Issues with Relations in 3NF

Consider a database for scheduling college classes and we have a relation as follows,

| Building | Room | StartTime | EndTime | Instructor |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IH | 1121 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Amy |
| IH | 1121 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | Will |
| IA | 325 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | John |
| IA | 325 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Will |

Is this relation in 3NF?

- But due to the existence of these FD's
- Instructor $\rightarrow$ \{Building, Room, StartTime\}
- Instructor $\rightarrow$ \{Building, Room, EndTime\}
- If we change an instructor's name without checking on meeting location and time for the rows for the instructor, there is a chance we put the instructor at two locations at the same time!
- That is an update anomaly!


## Boyce-Codd Normal Form (BCNF)

A relation R is in Boyce-Codd normal form (BCNF) if for every nontrivial functional dependency $X \rightarrow A$ where X is a key of R .

What does this mean?

- Anything but the key - no attribute depends on anything other than a key (excluding trivial dependencies)


## Normalizing 3NF to BCNF

Convert 3NF to BCNF

- To put the relation in BCNF, create a separate table based on the functional dependency $X \rightarrow$ that violates BCNF.
- For this example, remove (Instructor, Building, Room, StartTime) to a separate relation.
- Or remove (Instructor, Building, Room, EndTime) to a separate relation.
- Use the foreign key constraint to Link the two relations


## Example: Normalizing 3NF to BCNF

| Building | Room | StartTime | EndTime | Instructor |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IH | 1121 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Amy |
| IH | 1121 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | Will |
| IA | 325 | $09: 30$ | $10: 45$ | John |
| IA | 325 | $11: 00$ | $12: 15$ | Will |


| Building | Room | StartTime | EndTime | Building | Room | StartTime | Instructor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IH | 1121 | 11:00 | 12:15 | IH | 1121 | 11:00 | Amy |
| IH | 1121 | 09:30 | 10:45 | IH | 1121 | 09:30 | Will |
| IA | 325 | 09:30 | 10:45 | IA | 325 | 09:30 | John |
| IA | 325 | 11:00 | 12:15 | IA | 325 | 11:00 | Will |
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## Properties of Decomposition

Discussed a property of decomposition

- Elimination of Anomalies
- Decompose a relation to normal forms to reduce redundancies; which reduces chances of anomalies.
Not discussed what other properties we should have - You should continue to explore these on your own.
- Recoverability of information - can we recover the original relation from the tuples in its decomposition?
- Preservation of dependencies - can we satisfy the original functional dependencies when we reconstruct the original relation from the decomposition by joining?


## Comparison of Normal Forms

Also explore more on your own

## Property 3NF BCNF 4NF

Eliminate redundancy due to FD's $\mathrm{No}^{2}$ Yes Yes Eliminates redundancy due to MVD's ${ }^{1}$ No No Yes Preserves FD's Yes $\mathrm{No}^{3} \quad \mathrm{No}^{3}$
Preserves MVD's ${ }^{4}$ No No No

1: MVD - multivalued dependencies
${ }^{2}$ : Although "No", 3NF is often enough to eliminate this redundancy.
${ }^{3}$ : BCNF does not guarantee preservation of FD's, but in typical cases (or often) the dependencies are preserved.
${ }^{4}$ : None of the normal forms guarantee preservation of MVD's, although in typical cases (often), the dependencies are preserved.
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## Summary

Normal Form Characteristics

1NF 2NF $\quad 1 \mathrm{NF}$ and no partial dependencies
3NF BCNF
simple table, no repeating groups, and PK identified

2NF and no transitive dependencies
Every determinant is a key (nothing but the key)

On your own

- Properties of decomposition
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## Assignment

Let's work on an assignment using paper and pencil/pen ...

