

# Lecture 8: Design Theory III

## Announcements

- Grades for PS1 on Canvas.
  - For grading questions: ***your best bet is Minzhen***



***Minzhen is the real BOSS!***

## Announcements

- Grades for PS1 on Canvas.
  - For grading questions: ***your best bet is Minzhen (She is the real BOSS)***
- Project part 1 due next Wednesday 10/4 @ Midnight.
  - PUSH PUSH PUSH!
  - Discussion at the end of the lecture today

## Announcements

- Grades for PS1 on Canvas.
  - For grading questions: ***your best bet is Minzhen (She is the real BOSS)***
- Project part 1 due next Wednesday 10/4 @ Midnight.
- PS2 is out! Due next Friday 10/6 @ Midnight.
  - MUCH EASIER! Focus on project!
  - Do PS2 while watching the game tomorrow!



# Today's Lecture

1. 3rd – Normal Form
2. Multi-Value Dependencies (MVDs)
  - ACTIVITY
3. Project Part1 - Discussion

# 1. 3NF and Dependency Preservation

# What you will learn about in this section

1. Recap: Dependency Preserving Decompositions
2. 3NF Definition
3. 3NF Decomposition

# Boyce-Codd Normal Form

BCNF is a simple condition for removing anomalies from relations:

A relation  $R$  is in BCNF if:

if  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\} \rightarrow B$  is a *non-trivial* FD in  $R$

then  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  is a **superkey** for  $R$

*Equivalently:*  $\forall$  sets of attributes  $X$ , either  $(X^+ = X)$  or  $(X^+ = \text{all attributes})$

In other words: there are no “bad” FDs



# Boyce-Codd Normal Form

BCNF is a simple condition for removing anomalies from relations:

A relation  $R$  is in BCNF if:

if  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\} \rightarrow B$  is a *non-trivial* FD in  $R$

then  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  is a **superkey** for  $R$

*Equivalently:*  $\forall$  sets of attributes  $X$ , either  $(X^+ = X)$  or  $(X^+ = \text{all attributes})$

In other words: there are no “bad” FDs

# Dependency Preserving Decompositions

- Given **R** and a set of FDs  $F$ , we decompose **R** into **R1** and **R2**. Suppose:
  - **R1** has a set of FDs  $F1$
  - **R2** has a set of FDs  $F2$
  - $F1$  and  $F2$  are computed from  $F$

A decomposition is **dependency preserving** if by enforcing  $F1$  over **R1** and  $F2$  over **R2**, we can enforce  $F$  over **R**

# Bad Example

<u>Unit</u>	Company
Galaga99	UW
Bingo	UW

Unit	Product
Galaga99	Databases
Bingo	Databases

No problem so far.  
All *local* FD's are satisfied.

$\{\text{Unit}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Company}\}$

Unit	Company	Product
Galaga99	UW	Databases
Bingo	UW	Databases

Let's put all the data back into a single table again:

Violates the FD  $\{\text{Company}, \text{Product}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Unit}\}!!$

# Possible Solutions

- Various ways to handle so that decompositions are all lossless / no FDs lost
  - For example **3NF**- stop short of full BCNF decompositions.
- Usually a tradeoff between redundancy / data anomalies and FD preservation...

BCNF still most common- with additional steps to keep track of lost FDs...

# 3NF Definition

A relation R is in **3NF** if:

If  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\} \rightarrow B$  is a *non-trivial* FD in R

then  $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$  is a superkey for R **OR**

B is part of some key of R (***prime attribute***)

BCNF implies 3NF. Why?

# Why use 3NF?

- **Example:**  $R(A, B, C)$  with  $A, B \rightarrow C$  and  $C \rightarrow A$ 
  - is in 3NF. Why?
  - is not in BCNF. Why?

Compromise used when BCNF not  
achievable: *aim for BCNF and settle for 3NF*

Lossless-join and dependency preserving decomposition  
into a collection of 3NF relations is always possible!

# 3NF Decomposition

1. Apply the algorithm for **BCNF decomposition** until all relations are in 3NF (we can stop earlier than BCNF)
2. Compute a **minimal basis**  $F'$  of  $F$
3. For each non-preserved FD  $X \rightarrow A$  in  $F'$ , add a new relation  $R(X, A)$

*This is not fair game; read textbook for minimal basis*

You only need to remember that to get 3NF we stop short of full BCNF decompositions

# 3. MVDs



# What you will learn about in this section

1. MVDs

2. ACTIVITY

# Multi-Value Dependencies (MVDs)

- A multi-value dependency (MVD) is another type of dependency that could hold in our data, ***which is not captured by FDs***
- Formal definition:
  - Given a relation  $R$  having attribute set  $A$ , and two sets of attributes  $X, Y \subseteq A$
  - The ***multi-value dependency (MVD)***  $X \twoheadrightarrow Y$  holds on  $R$  if
  - ***for any tuples***  $t_1, t_2 \in R$  s.t.  $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$ , there exists a tuple  $t_3$  s.t.:
    - $t_1[X] = t_2[X] = t_3[X]$
    - $t_1[Y] = t_3[Y]$
    - $t_2[A \setminus Y] = t_3[A \setminus Y]$ 
      - Where  $A \setminus B$  means “elements of set  $A$  not in set  $B$ ”

# Multi-Value Dependencies (MVDs)

- One less formal, literal way to phrase the definition of an MVD:
- **The MVD  $X \twoheadrightarrow Y$**  holds on R if for any pair of tuples with the same X values, the “swapped” pair of tuples with the same X values, but the other permutations of Y and A\Y values, is also in R

Ex:  $X = \{x\}$ ,  $Y = \{y\}$ :

x	y	z
1	0	1
1	1	0



For  $X \twoheadrightarrow Y$  to hold must have...

x	y	z
1	0	1
1	1	0
1	0	0
1	1	1

Note the connection to a local *cross-product*...

# Multi-Value Dependencies (MVDs)

- Another way to understand MVDs, in terms of *conditional independence*:
- **The MVD  $X \twoheadrightarrow Y$**  holds on R if given X, Y is conditionally independent of  $A \setminus Y$  and vice versa...

Here, given  $x = 1$ , we know for ex. that:

$y = 0 \rightarrow z = 1$

I.e. z is conditionally *dependent* on y given x

x	y	z
1	0	1
1	1	0

Here, this is not the case!

I.e. z is conditionally *independent* of y given x

x	y	z
1	0	1
1	1	0
1	0	0
1	1	1

# Multiple Value Dependencies (MVDs)

A “real life” example...



*Grad student thinks:*  
“Hmm... what is real life??  
Watching a movie over the  
weekend?”

# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

Movie_theater	film_name	snack
UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

Are there any functional dependencies that might hold here?

No...

And yet it seems like there is some pattern / dependency...

# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

Movie_theater	film_name	snack
UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

For a given movie theatre...

# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

Movie_theater	film_name	snack
UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

For a given movie theatre...

Given a set of movies and snacks...



# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

Movie_theater	film_name	snack
UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

For a given movie theatre...

Given a set of movies and snacks...

Any movie / snack combination is possible!

# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

	Movie_theater (A)	film_name (B)	Snack (C)
$t_1$	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
$t_2$	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

More formally, we write  $\{A\} \twoheadrightarrow \{B\}$  if for any tuples  $t_1, t_2$  s.t.  $t_1[A] = t_2[A]$

# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

	Movie_theater (A)	film_name (B)	Snack (C)
$t_1$	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
$t_3$	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
$t_2$	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

More formally, we write  $\{A\} \twoheadrightarrow \{B\}$  if for any tuples  $t_1, t_2$  s.t.  $t_1[A] = t_2[A]$  there is a tuple  $t_3$  s.t.

- $t_3[A] = t_1[A]$

# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

	Movie_theater (A)	film_name (B)	Snack (C)
$t_1$	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
$t_3$	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
$t_2$	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

More formally, we write  $\{A\} \twoheadrightarrow \{B\}$  if for any tuples  $t_1, t_2$  s.t.  $t_1[A] = t_2[A]$  there is a tuple  $t_3$  s.t.

- $t_3[A] = t_1[A]$
- $t_3[B] = t_1[B]$

# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

	Movie_theater (A)	film_name (B)	Snack (C)
$t_1$	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
$t_3$	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
$t_2$	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

More formally, we write  $\{A\} \twoheadrightarrow \{B\}$  if for any tuples  $t_1, t_2$  s.t.  $t_1[A] = t_2[A]$  there is a tuple  $t_3$  s.t.

- $t_3[A] = t_1[A]$
- $t_3[B] = t_1[B]$
- and  $t_3[R \setminus B] = t_2[R \setminus B]$

Where  $R \setminus B$  is “R minus B” i.e. the attributes of R not in B

# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

	Movie_theater (A)	film_name (B)	Snack (C)
$t_2$	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
$t_3$	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
$t_1$	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

Note this also works!

Remember, an MVD holds over *a relation or an instance*, so defn. must hold for every applicable pair...

# MVDs: Movie Theatre Example

	Movie_theater (A)	film_name (B)	Snack (C)
t <sub>2</sub>	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Kale Chips
	UWM 1	Star Trek: The Wrath of Kahn	Burrito
t <sub>3</sub>	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Kale Chips
t <sub>1</sub>	UWM 1	Lord of the Rings: Concatenated & Extended Edition	Burrito
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Ramen
	UWM 2	Star Wars: The Boba Fett Prequel	Plain Pasta

This expresses a sort of dependency (= data redundancy) that we *can't* express with FDs

*\*Actually, it expresses conditional independence (between film and snack given movie theatre)!*

# Connection to FDs

If  $A \rightarrow B$  does  $A \twoheadrightarrow B$  ?



# Comments on MVDs

- MVDs have “rules” too!
  - **Experts:** Axiomatizable
- 4<sup>th</sup> Normal Form is “non-trivial MVD”
- *For AI nerds:* MVD is conditional independence in graphical models!

See the MVDs IPython notebook  
for more examples!

# Summary

- Constraints allow one to reason about **redundancy** in the data
- Normal forms describe how to **remove** this redundancy by **decomposing** relations
  - Elegant—by representing data appropriately certain errors are essentially impossible
  - For FDs, BCNF is the normal form.
- A tradeoff for insert performance: 3NF

# 3. Project Part 1: Discussion

# Going Once, Going Twice ...



**Q:** Is it a **relationship** or an **entity set**?

**A:** Should it be a **set** or a **multiset**? Do I need multiple instances of an element or one?

# Going Once, Going Twice ...



**Q:** Is a User a Seller or a Buyer?

**A:** Think of what the current json schema says. “Note that a user may be a bidder in one auction and a seller in another. However, his Rating, Location, and Country information are the same wherever he appears in our data (which reflects a snapshot in time).”

# Going Once, Going Twice ...



**Q:** Currently and Number\_of\_Bids?

**A:** Just follow the description 😊