

Can Also Test if FDs imply JD

Use slightly different convention for distinguished variables (dvs)

Special variables, one in each column

- marked with an underline
- will use for a test for a JD

Tableau for JD $\bowtie[R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n]$

Has n rows, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n

$w_i[R_i]$ = distinguished variables

$w_i[R - R_i]$ = unique non-distinguished variables (ndvs)

Example JD Tableau

$\bowtie[AB, BCD, DE]$

A	B	C	D	E
<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	c1	d1	e1
a1	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	e2
a2	b1	c2	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>

If you want to see if FDs F imply a JD J

- Do the chase of the tableau with FD-rules for F
- Always replace ndv by dv
- See if you get the row of all dvs

CS 589, Principles of Database Systems, Unit 2, Notes 2

Principles of Database Systems

Example Chase

$F = \{B \rightarrow C, C \rightarrow E, D \rightarrow C, CE \rightarrow D\}$

Apply $B \rightarrow C$

A	B	C	D	E
<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	d1	e1
a1	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	e2
a2	b1	c2	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>

Unit 2: Notes 2

David Maier

3

Principles of Database Systems

Final result

A	B	C	D	E
<u>a</u>	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>
a1	<u>b</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>
a2	b1	<u>c</u>	<u>d</u>	<u>e</u>

We produced a row of all dvs, so the JD is implied by F.

What's going on here?

Unit 2: Notes 2

David Maier

4

JD Rule

Can also use JDs to modify a tableau

- FD-rule: equate variables
- JD-rule: add rows

$\bowtie[R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n]$

- Find rows w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n in tableau U
- and find a row v (not already in U) where
 - $v[R_1] = w_1[R_1]$
 - $v[R_2] = w_2[R_2]$
 - \dots
 - $v[R_n] = w_n[R_n]$
- then add v to U

JD-rule Example

$M = \{\bowtie[ABC, CD], BD \rightarrow A\}$

Implies $BC \rightarrow A$? Implies $BC \rightarrow D$?

	A	B	C	D
w_1	a_1	b_1	c_1	d_1
w_2	a_2	b_1	c_1	d_2

Can apply JD-rule two ways

$w_1[ABC], w_2[CD]$
 $v_1 = \langle a_1 \ b_1 \ c_1 \ d_2 \rangle$
 $w_2[ABC], w_1[CD]$
 $v_2 = \langle a_2 \ b_1 \ c_1 \ d_1 \rangle$

JD-rule Example cont.

With additional rows:

	A	B	C	D
w1	a1	b1	c1	d1
w2	a2	b1	c1	d2
v1	a1	b1	c1	d2
v2	a2	b1	c1	d1

Apply $BD \rightarrow A$ to set a2 equal to a1

	A	B	C	D
w1	a1	b1	c1	d1
w2	a1	b1	c1	d2
v1	a1	b1	c1	d2
v2	a1	b1	c1	d1

JD-rule Example cont.

Remove duplicate rows:

	A	B	C	D
w1	a1	b1	c1	d1
w2	a1	b1	c1	d2

See that $BC \rightarrow A$, but not $BC \rightarrow D$

Facts about the Chase

- Order of rule application doesn't matter
 - Need consistent rule for variable replacement, e.g.
 - lower # replaces higher #
 - dvs replace ndvs
- Chase can be large if there are JDs
- Complete for JD and FD inference
- Can be used to simplify queries and fill in missing instance information

Query Simplification Example

```
select a1.D, a2.P
from assign as a1, a2, a3
where a1.P = Chin and
      a1.L = a2.L and a2.D = 8may and
      a2.P = a3.P and a3.D = 8may and
      a1.T = a3.T
```

Tableau for this (allow constants)

assign(PILOT	FLT	DATE	TIME)
a1	Chin	f1	d1	t1
a2	p1	f1	8may	t2
a3	p1	f2	8may	t1
result	p1		d1	

Apply Chase to Query Tableau

$F = \{L \rightarrow T, PDT \rightarrow L, LD \rightarrow P\}$

Apply $L \rightarrow T$

assign(PILOT	FLT	DATE	TIME)
a1	Chin	f1	d1	t1
a2	p1	f1	8may	t1
a3	p1	f2	8may	t1
result	p1		d1	

Apply $PDT \rightarrow L$

assign(PILOT	FLT	DATE	TIME)
a1	Chin	f1	d1	t1
a2	p1	f1	8may	t1
a3	p1	f1	8may	t1
result	p1		d1	

Remove Duplicate Rows from Result

assign(PILOT	FLT	DATE	TIME)
a1	Chin	f1	d1	t1
a2,a3	p1	f1	8may	t1
result	p1		d1	

As SQL:

```

select a2.P, a1.D
from assign as a1, a2
where a1.P = Chin and
      a1.L = a2.L and a2.D = 8may and
      a1.T = a2.T
    
```

Inclusion Dependencies

Similar to referential integrity constraints in SQL databases

Usually go between two relations: values in one must appear in the other

Example Inclusions

sched(FLIGHT	FROM	TO	DEPART	ARRIVE)
83	PDX	SEA	10:15a	11:00a
116	SEA	PDX	1:25p	2:05p
281	SEA	PDX	5:50a	6:30a
301	PDX	SEA	6:35p	7:15p
319	PDX	SFO	9:30a	11:15a
412	SFO	PDX	1:25p	3:10p

dist(AIRPORT1	AIRPORT2	MILES)
PDX	SEA	155
SEA	PDX	155
PDX	SFO	585
SFO	PDX	585

Also Recall

<code>assigned(</code>	<code>PILOT</code>	<code>FLIGHT</code>	<code>DATE</code>	<code>TIME)</code>
	Cushing	83	9 Aug	10:15a
	Clark	83	11 Aug	10:15a
	Chin	83	13 Aug	10:15a
	Cushing	116	10 Aug	1:25p
	Chin	116	12 Aug	1:25p
	Clark	281	8 Aug	5:50a
	Copley	281	9 Aug	5:50a
	Copley	281	13 Aug	5:50a
	Clark	301	12 Aug	6:35p
	Copley	412	15 Aug	1:25p

Inclusions Dependencies for Example

Assigned flights must be in schedule

`assigned[L T] ⊆ sched[L DEP]`

Scheduled flights must have distances

`sched[FR TO] ⊆ dist[A1 A2]`

Must have same airports in both distance columns

`dist[A1] ⊆ dist[A2], dist[A2] ⊆ dist[A1]`

But, not every scheduled flight is necessarily assigned

`sched[L DEP] ⊄ assigned[L T]`

Axioms for Inclusion Dependencies

Attribute order is important

I1. Reflexivity: $r[X] \subseteq r[X]$

$\text{sched}[\text{DEP ARR}] \subseteq \text{sched}[\text{DEP ARR}]$

I2. Permutation: Change attribute order on both sides (in the same way)

$\text{assigned}[\text{L T}] \subseteq \text{sched}[\text{L DEP}]$ implies
 $\text{assigned}[\text{T L}] \subseteq \text{sched}[\text{DEP L}]$

I3. Projection: Remove attributes on both sides (in the same places)

$\text{sched}[\text{FR TO}] \subseteq \text{dist}[\text{A1 A2}]$ implies
 $\text{sched}[\text{FR}] \subseteq \text{dist}[\text{A1}]$

Axioms Continued

I4. Transitivity: $q[X] \subseteq r[Y]$ and
 $r[Y] \subseteq s[Z]$ imply $q[X] \subseteq s[Z]$

$\text{sched}[\text{FR}] \subseteq \text{dist}[\text{A1}]$ and
 $\text{dist}[\text{A1}] \subseteq \text{dist}[\text{A2}]$ imply
 $\text{sched}[\text{FR}] \subseteq \text{dist}[\text{A2}]$