Decomposition of a Relation Schema:

- If a relation is not in a desired normal form, it can be decomposed into multiple relations that each are in that normal form.
- Suppose that relation R contains attributes A1 ... An. A decomposition of R consists of replacing R by two or more relations such that:
 - Each new relation scheme contains a subset of the attributes of R, and
 - Every attribute of R appears as an attribute of at least one of the new relations.
- When we decompose a relation schema R with a set of functional dependencies F into R1, R2, ..., Rn we want:
 - Lossless-join decomposition
 - No redundancy
 - Dependency preservation
 - To test if we have lossless-joins, we can use the **chase test**.

Chase Test:

- **E.g.** Given R(K, L, M, N, P), the FDs

 $\mathsf{L} \to \mathsf{P}$

 $\mathsf{MP} \to \mathsf{K}$

 $\mathsf{KM}\to\mathsf{P}$

 $\mathsf{LM}\to\mathsf{N}$

and the fact that we decomposed R into

R1(K, L, M)

R2(L, M, N)

R3(K, M, P)

Use the chase test to see if the decomposition is lossless.

Soln:

First, we make a table with the attributes listed on the first row and the decomposed relations listed on the first column. Then, for each decomposed relation, we put a α under the attributes that the relation has. I.e. If relation Rn has attribute x, we put a α in the cell (Rn, x).

	К	L	Μ	Ν	Р
R1	α	α	α		
R2	α	α		α	
R3	α		α		α

Second, we run each FD through all the relations and if we can get a new attribute, we put a α under the new attribute we got for that relation.

	К	L	М	Ν	Р
R1	α	α	α		α
R2	α	α		α	α
R3	α		α		α

Let's start with the FD L \rightarrow P. Since R1 and R2 both have attribute L but not attribute P, they both get a new attribute. Hence, I'll put a α in the cells (R1, P) and (R2, P).

We go to the next FD, MP \rightarrow K. Nothing changes since R1, R2 and R3 all have α under the K column.

We go to the next FD, KM \rightarrow P. Nothing changes since R1, R2 and R3 all have α under the P column.

	к	L	М	Ν	Ρ
R1	α	α	α	α	α
R2	α	α		α	α
R3	α		α		α

We go to the next FD, $LM \rightarrow N$. We add a α to (R1, N).

We stop here since R1 has α for each of the attributes. This means that the decomposition is lossless.

Note: If we didn't have a relation with α 's under all the attributes, we'd repeat the process with the FDs until we get a relation with α 's under all the attributes or until we can't change anything anymore.

E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D) and the FDs $A \rightarrow B$ $B \rightarrow C$ $CD \rightarrow A$ and the fact that we decomposed R into $R1 = \{A, D\}$ $R2 = \{A, C\}$ $R3 = \{B, C, D\}$. Use the chase test to see if the decomposition is lossless.

Soln:

-

This is the initial table.

	А	В	С	D
R1	α			α
R2	α		α	
R3		α	α	α

Using the FD A \rightarrow B, we get the new table

	А	В	С	D
R1	α	α		α
R2	α	α	α	
R3		α	α	α

Using the FD A \rightarrow C, we get the new table

	А	В	С	D
R1	α	α	α	α
R2	α	α	α	
R3		α	α	α

We stop here because we see that R1 has α for each attribute. This means that the decomposition is lossless.

Decomposition for 1NF:

- A table is in 1NF if each cell can only contain 1 value.
- Decomposition Method:
 - If a cell contains multiple values, create a new row for each value.

Decomposition for 2NF:

- A table is in 2NF if:
 - It is in 1NF.
 - It does not have any partial dependencies (pds).

- Decomposition Method:

- Identify all the candidate keys.
- Identify the prime and non-prime attributes.
- Identify the partial dependencies.
- Decompose the relation for the candidate keys and all pds.
- E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D, E) and the FDs
- $AB \rightarrow C$

 $\mathsf{D}\to\mathsf{E}$

Determine if R is in 2NF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in 2NF.

Soln:

Notice how the RHS of the FDs do not contain A, B and D. Hence, we know that all candidate keys must contain at least A, B and D. The closure of ABD is {A, B, C, D, E}, so in this case, the candidate key is {A, B, D}.

Since the candidate key is {A, B, D}, the prime attributes are A, B and D and the non-prime attributes are C and E.

We see that $AB \rightarrow C$ and $D \rightarrow E$ are pds.

I will decompose R into: R1(A, B, C) R2(D, E) R3(A, B, D)

 E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D) and the FDs AB → CD A → D
 Determine if R is in 2NF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in 2NF.

Soln:

Notice how the RHS of the FDs do not contain A and B. Hence, we know that all candidate keys must contain at least A and B. The closure of AB is {A, B, C, D}, so in this case, the candidate key is {A, B}.

Since the candidate key is {A, B}, the prime attributes are A and B and the non-prime attributes are C and D.

We see that A \rightarrow D is a pd. AB \rightarrow CD isn't a pd since CD depends on A and B.

I will decompose R into: R1(A, D) R2(A, B, C)

E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D, E) and the FDs AB → C B → D E → D
Determine if R is in 2NF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in 2NF.

Soln:

Notice how the RHS of the FDs do not contain A, B and E. Hence, we know that all candidate keys must contain at least A, B and E. The closure of ABE is {A, B, C, D, E}, so in this case, the candidate key is {A, B, E}.

Since the candidate key is {A, B, E}, the prime attributes are A, B and E and the non-prime attributes are C and D.

 $AB \rightarrow C, B \rightarrow D \text{ and } E \rightarrow D \text{ are all pds.}$

I will decompose R into: R1(A, B, C) R2(B, D) R3(E, D) R4(A, B, E)

Decomposition for 3NF:

- A table is in 3NF if:
 - It is in 2NF.
 - It does not have any transitive dependencies (tds).

- Decomposition Method:

- Identify all the candidate keys.
- Identify the prime and non-prime attributes.
- Identify the partial dependencies and the transitive dependencies.
- Decompose the relation for the candidate keys, all pds and all tds.
- **E.g.** Given R(A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H) and the FDs
- A→B

ABCD \rightarrow E EF \rightarrow GH ACDF \rightarrow EG Determine if R is in 3NF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in 3NF.

Soln:

We see that the RHS of any FD does not include A, C, D and F. Hence, any candidate keys must contain at least A, C, D and F. The closure of ACDF is {A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H}. Hence, {A, C, D, F} is a candidate key.

The prime attributes are A, C, D, F. The non-prime attributes are B, E, G, H.

 $\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{B} \text{ is a pd.} \\ \mathsf{ABCD} \to \mathsf{E} \text{ is a td.} \\ \mathsf{EF} \to \mathsf{GH} \text{ is a td.} \end{array}$

I will decompose R into R1(A, B) R2(A, C, D, E) R3(E, F, G) R4(E, F, H) R5(A, C, D, F)

E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D) and the FDs
 C → DA
 B → C
 Determine if R is in 3NF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in 3NF.

Soln:

We see that B is not in the RHS of any FD, so all candidate keys must contain at least B. The closure of B is {B, C, D, A}, so {B} is a candidate key.

The prime attribute is B. The non-prime attributes are A, C, D.

We see that $C \rightarrow DA$ is a td.

I will decompose R into: R1(B, C) R2(C, D, A)

E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D) and the FDs AB → CD C → A D → B
Determine if R is in 3NF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in 3NF.

Soln:

We see that the candidate keys are $\{A, B\}$, $\{C, D\}$, $\{A, D\}$ and $\{B, C\}$.

The prime attributes are A, B, C, and D.

There are no non-prime attributes.

Since all attributes are prime attributes, we will never get $P \rightarrow NP$ (pd) or $NP \rightarrow NP$ (td). Hence, R is in 3NF already.

Decomposition for BCNF:

- A table is in BCNF if:
 - It is in 3NF.
 - For each non-trivial FD $X \rightarrow Y$, X must be a super key.
- Decomposition Method #1:
 - decompose (R, $X \rightarrow Y$):

R1(R - Y)

R2(X + Y)

Project FDs onto R1 and R2 recursively call decompose on R1 and R2 for BCNF violations.

- Decomposition Method #2:

decompose (R, $X \rightarrow Y$): R1(X⁺) R2(R - (X⁺ - X))

(X - X)

Project FDs onto R1 and R2 recursively call decompose on R1 and R2 for BCNF violations.

- **E.g.** Given R(A, B, C) and the FDs

 $\mathsf{A}\to\mathsf{B}$

 $\mathsf{B}\to\mathsf{C}$

Determine if R is in BCNF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in BCNF.

Soln:

The candidate key is {A}. Hence, $B \rightarrow C$ is a td, meaning that R is not in BCNF. I'll decompose R into R1(A, B) R2(B, C)

```
- E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D, E) and the FDs A \rightarrow B
BC \rightarrow D
```

Determine if R is in BCNF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in BCNF.

Soln:

The candidate key is {A, C, E}. Hence, A \rightarrow B is a pd and BC \rightarrow D is a td, meaning that R is not in BCNF. I will use A \rightarrow B. I'll decompose R into R1(A, B) \leftarrow R1(X⁺) R2(A, C, D, E) \leftarrow R2(R - (X⁺ - X))

We can decompose R2 further. We know that since A \rightarrow B and BC \rightarrow D, by the pseudo transitivity axiom, AC \rightarrow D. This means that R2 isn't in BCNF as AC isn't a super key, so we have to decompose R2 further. R21(A, C, D) R22(A, C, E)

The final decomposition is R1(A, B) R21(A, C, D) R22(A, C, E)

- **E.g.** Given R(A, B, C, D, E, H) and the FDs $A \rightarrow BC$ E $\rightarrow HA$

Determine if R is in BCNF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in BCNF.

Soln:

The candidate key is {D, E}. We see that A \rightarrow BC is td and E \rightarrow HA is pd. Hence, R is not in BCNF. I will use A \rightarrow BC. I will decompose R into R1(A, B, C) \leftarrow R1(X⁺) R2(A, D, E, H) \leftarrow R2(R - (X⁺ - X))

We see that there's an issue with R2. We still have the FD $E \rightarrow$ HA but E isn't a super key. We have to decompose R further. R21(D, E) R22(E, H, A)

The final decomposition is R1(A, B, C) R21(D, E) R22(E, H, A) E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D) and the FDs
 C → DA
 B → C
 Determine if R is in BCNF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in BCNF.

Soln:

We see that B is not in the RHS of any FD, so all candidate keys must contain at least B. The closure of B is {B, C, D, A}, so {B} is a candidate key.

The prime attribute is B. The non-prime attributes are A, C, D.

We see that $C \rightarrow DA$ is a td.

I will decompose R into R1(C, D, A) R2(B, C)

E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D) and the FDs

 $\begin{array}{l} AB \rightarrow CD \\ C \rightarrow A \\ D \rightarrow B \end{array}$

Determine if R is in BCNF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in BCNF.

Soln:

We see that the candidate keys are {A, B}, {C, D}, {A, D} and {B, C}. We see that $C \rightarrow A$ and $D \rightarrow B$ violates BCNF. I will use $C \rightarrow A$. I will decompose R into R1(C, A) R2(B, C, D)

We see that the FD D \rightarrow B still applies for R2, so it is not in BCNF. I will decompose R2 into R21(D, B) R22(C, D)

The final decomposition is R1(C, A) R21(D, B) R22(C, D) E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D, E) and the FDs
 A → BC
 C → DE
 Determine if R is in BCNF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in BCNF.

Soln:

We see that the candidate key is {A}. Hence, $C \rightarrow DE$ is a td, meaning that R is not in BCNF. I will decompose R into R1(C, D, E) R2(A, B, C)

 E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D) and the FDs AB → C B → D C → A
 Determine if R is in BCNF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in BCNF.

Soln:

We see that the candidate keys are {A, B} and {B, C}. Hence, $B \rightarrow D$ and $C \rightarrow A$ violate BCNF as the LHS are not super keys. I will use $B \rightarrow D$. I will decompose R into R1(B, D) R2(A, B, C)

We see that the FD C \rightarrow A still holds for R2, so it is not in BCNF. I will decompose R2 into R21(C, A) R22(B, C)

The final decomposition is R1(B, D) R21(C, A) R22(B, C)

E.g. Given R(A, B, C, D) and the FDs
 A → BCD
 BC → AD
 D → B
 Determine if R is in BCNF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in BCNF.

Soln:

We see that the candidate keys are {A} and {B, C}. Hence, $D \rightarrow B$ is a td and violates BCNF. I will decompose R into R1(D, B) R2(A, C, D)

Decomposition for 4NF:

- A table is in 4NF if:
 - It is in BCNF.
 - It does not have any multi-valued dependencies (mvds).
- Decomposition Method: decompose (R, X -->> Y): R1 = XY
 - R2 = X union (R Y)

Repeat on R1 and R2 until all relations are in 4NF.

- **E.g.** Given R(A, B, C, D) and the FD $A \rightarrow B$

and the mvds

A -->> C

A -->> D

Determine if R is in 4NF, and if it isn't decompose it so that the relations are in 4NF.

Soln:

We see that the candidate key is {A, C, D}. We see that $A \rightarrow B$ violates BCNF while A -->> C and A -->> D violates 4NF. I will use $A \rightarrow B$. I will decompose R into R1(A, B) R2(A, C, D)

R2 violates 4NF because of the mvds. I will decompose R2 using A -->> C. R21(A, C) R22(A, D)

The final decomposition is R1(A, B) R21(A, C) R22(A, D)