## UTS: ENGINEERING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY



# **lecture 6: Normalization**

Combined File (Parts 1 & 2)

Main reference:

Modern Database Management, 11<sup>th</sup> Edition Chapter 4: Logical Database Design and the Relational Model

**Subject Coordinator and Instructor:** 

Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

Innovation in practice eng.uts.edu.au • it.uts.edu.au

UTS CRICOS PROVIDER CODE: 001997

# If you have any question and you don't want to share it now, send it to us via UTSOnline/Discussion Board.

# However, it is better to speak out ©

## Please follow the following signs in the lecture slide ©



# **Subject Flowchart**



# **Subject Overview**

## Design Entity Relationship Diagram (ERD)

- > Week 1: Data Modelling I (Conceptual Level): Entity, Attributes, PK, FK, ...
- > Week 2: Data Definition Language (DDL): Create tables, constraints, insert, ...
- > Week 3: Data Modelling II (Conceptual Level): Associative, Weak, ...
- Week 4: Data Modelling III (Conceptual Level): Subtype/Supertype
- > Week 5: Convert ERD to Relations (Logical Level)
- > Week 6: Functional Dependencies, and Normalization

## Data manipulation

- > Week 7: Simple Query
- > Week 8: Multiple Table Queries
- > Week 9: Subquery
- Week 10: Correlated Subquery

# **Lecture Five Objectives:**

Introduction: Why we need to do normalization and what are the anomalies?

#### 1. Terms to Know to Do Normalization

- 1.1. Functional Dependencies
- 1.2. Keys: Super-key, Candidate key and Primary Key
- 1.3. Determining Candidate Keys from Functional Dependencies (FDs)
- 1.4. Partial Functional Dependencies
- 1.5. Transitive Functional Dependencies
- 1.6 Why Partial and Transitive FDS cause the anomalies?

### 2. Well-Structured Relations and Data Normalization

- 3. Steps in normalization
- 4. First Normal Form
- 5. Second Normal Form
- 6. Third Normal Form



# Why we need to do normalization?





- You have designed your ERD.
- You have converted your ERD to the relations.

> Questions:

- 1. Are your relations well-structured?
- 2. Will you have any redundant data in your relations?
- 3. Will you have any data inconsistency in your database?

## **Example 1–Figure 4-2b**

| EMPLOY | EE2              |              |        |              |               |
|--------|------------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------------|
| EmpID  | Name             | DeptName     | Salary | CourseTitle  | DateCompleted |
| 100    | Margaret Simpson | Marketing    | 48,000 | SPSS         | 6/19/201X     |
| 100    | Margaret Simpson | Marketing    | 48,000 | Surveys      | 10/7/201X     |
| 140    | Alan Beeton      | Accounting   | 52,000 | Tax Acc      | 12/8/201X     |
| 110    | Chris Lucero     | Info Systems | 43,000 | Visual Basic | 1/12/201X     |
| 110    | Chris Lucero     | Info Systems | 43,000 | C++          | 4/22/201X     |
| 190    | Lorenzo Davis    | Finance      | 55,000 |              |               |
| 150    | Susan Martin     | Marketing    | 42,000 | SPSS         | 6/19/201X     |
| 150    | Susan Martin     | Marketing    | 42,000 | Java         | 8/12/201X     |

Question–Is this a relation? Answer–Yes: Unique rows and no multivalued attributes

Question–What's the primary key? Answer–Composite: EmpID, CourseTitle



Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

## Is this relation (table) well-structured? Have a look at the anomalies in this Table:

| EMPLOYEE2 |                  |              |        |              |               |  |  |  |
|-----------|------------------|--------------|--------|--------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| EmpID     | Name             | DeptName     | Salary | CourseTitle  | DateCompleted |  |  |  |
| 100       | Margaret Simpson | Marketing    | 48,000 | SPSS         | 6/19/201X     |  |  |  |
| 100       | Margaret Simpson | Marketing    | 48,000 | Surveys      | 10/7/201X     |  |  |  |
| 140       | Alan Beeton      | Accounting   | 52,000 | Tax Acc      | 12/8/201X     |  |  |  |
| 110       | Chris Lucero     | Info Systems | 43,000 | Visual Basic | 1/12/201X     |  |  |  |
| 110       | Chris Lucero     | Info Systems | 43,000 | C++          | 4/22/201X     |  |  |  |
| 190       | Lorenzo Davis    | Finance      | 55,000 |              |               |  |  |  |
| 150       | Susan Martin     | Marketing    | 42,000 | SPSS         | 6/19/201X     |  |  |  |
| 150       | Susan Martin     | Marketing    | 42,000 | Java         | 8/12/201X     |  |  |  |

- ➤ Insertion Anomaly: can't enter a new employee without having the employee take a class (or at least empty fields of class information) → Why?
- Deletion Anomaly : if we remove employee 140, we lose information about the existence of a Tax Acc class.
- > Modification Anomaly : giving a salary increase to employee 100 forces us to update multiple records.

**Note:** The anomalies also happen after merging databases that are designed by the other database designers, or merging tables from different databases to create a new table.

# Example 2–Figure 4-26

Г

| OrderID | Order<br>Date | Customer<br>ID | Customer<br>Name     | Customer<br>Address | ProductID | Product<br>Description  | Product<br>Finish | Product<br>StandardPrice | Ordered<br>Quantity |
|---------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 7         | Dining<br>Table         | Natural<br>Ash    | 800.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 5         | Writer's<br>Desk        | Cherry            | 325.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 1                   |
| 1007    | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 11        | 4–Dr<br>Dresser         | Oak               | 500.00                   | 4                   |
| 1007    | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 3                   |

FIGURE 4-26 INVOICE relation (1NF) (Pine Valley Furniture Company)

Question–Is this a relation? Answer–Yes: Unique rows and no multivalued attributes

Question–What's the primary key? Answer–Composite: OrderID, ProductID



Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

## Is this relation (table) well-structured? Have a look at the anomalies in this Table:

| <u>OrderID</u> | Order<br>Date | Customer<br>ID | Customer<br>Name     | Customer<br>Address | ProductID | Product<br>Description  | Product<br>Finish | Product<br>StandardPrice | Ordered<br>Quantity |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 1006           | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 7         | Dining<br>Table         | Natural<br>Ash    | 800.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006           | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 5         | Writer's<br>Desk        | Cherry            | 325.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006           | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 1                   |
| 1007           | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 11        | 4–Dr<br>Dresser         | Oak               | 500.00                   | 4                   |
| 1007           | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 3                   |

FIGURE 4-26 INVOICE relation (1NF) (Pine Valley Furniture Company)

- Insertion Anomaly: if new product is ordered for order 1007 of existing customer, customer data must be re-entered, causing duplication
- Deletion Anomaly : if we delete the Dining Table from Order 1006, we lose information concerning this item's finish and price
- > Update (Modification) Anomaly: changing the price of product ID 4 requires update in multiple records.

**Note:** The anomalies also happen after merging databases that are designed by the other database designers, or merging tables from different databases to create a new table.

#### Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani



Solution of these problems:

You need to normalize your relations to solve these problems







#### Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani



# **1. Terms to Know for**

# Normalization





## **1. Terms to Know for Normalization**

- 1.1. Functional Dependencies
- 1.2. Keys: Super-key, Candidate key and Primary Key
- 1.3. Determining Candidate Keys from Functional Dependencies (FDs)
- 1.4. Partial Functional Dependencies
- 1.5. Transitive Functional Dependencies
- 1.6 Why Partial and Transitive FDS cause the anomalies?





## **1.1. Functional Dependencies**

**Functional Dependency**: A constraint between two attributes in which the value of one attribute (**dependent**) is **uniquely** determined by the value of another attribute(s) (**determinant**).

- The value of attribute X (determinant) uniquely determines the value attribute(s) Y (dependent)
   X -> Y
- The value of attributes X and Z (determinants) uniquely determine the value attribute(s) Y and M and N (dependents)

X, Z -> Y, M, N

Example:

Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

EmpID -> FName, Lname, DeptName, Salary



We determine Functional Dependencies based on

# the Business Rules and Forms.

# **NOT** based on the designed ERD.

Note: in the next slide I used the stored data to illustrate Functional Dependencies between attributes.



CustomerID → CustomerName, Customer\_Street, Customer\_City, Customer\_State, CustomerPostal\_Code

OrderID → OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, .....

| РК | Customer_ID | Customer_Name        | Customer_Street     | Customer_City | Customer_State | CustomerPostal_Code |
|----|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------------|
|    | 1           | Contemporary Casuals | 1355 S Hines Blvd   | Gainesville   | FL             | 32601-2871          |
|    | 2           | Value Furnitures     | 15145 S.W. 17th St. | Plano         | ТХ             | 75094-7743          |
|    | 3           | Homo Eurnishings     | 1900 Allard Ave     | Alhany        | NY             | 12209-1125          |
|    | <u>14.</u>  | ern Furnitu          | 25 Beltline         | Carteret      | NJ             | 7008-3188           |
|    | 5           | Impressions          | 5585 Westcott Ct.   | Sacramento    | CA             | 94200-4000          |
|    | 6           | Furniture Gallery    | 325 Flatiron Dr.    | Boulder       | СО             | 80514-4432          |
|    | 7           | New Furniture        | Palace Ave          | Farmington    | NM             | NULL                |
|    | PK Order_I  |                      | r_ID Order_         | Date          | FK             |                     |
|    |             |                      | )1 2/00/2           |               |                |                     |
|    |             | 100                  | 4/10/2              |               | 600            |                     |

19/07/2009

1/11/2009

4

1003

1004

Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani



Let's determine Functional Dependencies based on the following Business Rules:

**BR1:** Customers' information, like name and address, need to be stored in the database.

**BR2:** Any customer can place many orders.

**BR3:** Company needs to store order date for each order.

**BR1:** Customers' information, like name and address, need to be stored in the database.

**BR2:** Any customer can place many orders.

**BR3:** Company needs to store order date for each order.

Question: which of the following FD set is correct?

CustomerID  $\rightarrow$  CustomerName, Customer Street, Customer City, Customer State, CustomerPostal Code OrderID → OrderDate, CustomerID



OR

Α

В

CustomerID → CustomerName, Customer\_Street, Customer\_City, Customer\_State, CustomerPostal\_Code, OrderID  $OrderID \rightarrow OrderDate$ 

Question: OrderID functionally determines CustomerID or vice versa?

| Α | OrderID → OrderDate, CustomerID                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | $1002 \rightarrow 4/10/2009, 4$                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| В | CustomerID → CustomerName,, OrderID            |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | 4 → Eastern Furniture,, <b>1002 &amp; 1004</b> |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| РК | Customer_ID | Customer_Name        | Customer_Street     | Customer_City | Customer_State | CustomerPostal_Code |
|----|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------------|
|    | 1           | Contemporary Casuals | 1355 S Hines Blvd   | Gainesville   | FL             | 32601-2871          |
|    | 2           | Value Furnitures     | 15145 S.W. 17th St. | Plano         | ТХ             | 75094-7743          |
|    | 3           | Home Furnishings     | 1900 Allard Ave     | Albany        | NY             | 12209-1125          |
| -+ | 4           | Eastern Furniture    | 1925 Beltline Rd.   | Carteret      | NJ             | 07008-3188          |
|    | 5           | Impressions          | 5585 Westcott Ct.   | Sacramento    | CA             | 94206-4056          |
|    | 6           | Furniture Gallery    | 325 Flatiron Dr.    | Boulder       | со             | 80514-4432          |
|    | 7           | New Furniture        | Palace Ave          | Farmington    | NM             | NULL                |
|    |             |                      |                     |               |                |                     |





# **1.2. Keys of a Relation**

- > Super-Key:
  - Is a set of attributes within a table (relation) whose values can be used to uniquely identify a row in the relation.

## Candidate Key:

- An attribute, or minimal set of attributes, that uniquely identifies a row in a relation (A unique identifier).
- Each non-key field is functionally dependent on every candidate key.
- One of the candidate keys will become the primary key

E.g., perhaps there are both "credit card number" and "SS#" in a table. In this case both are candidate keys.

- > Primary Key:
  - Is a unique identifier
  - It cannot contain null values
  - One of the candidate keys will become the primary key



## Example: Super key, Candidate Key and PK



Note: Names are not a good choice to be a PK.

## Class Activity 5.1 (3 minutes)

#### Explain two properties that must be satisfied by candidate keys?

a) Non-redundancy:

No attribute in the key can be deleted without destroying the property of unique identification.

| StudentId | firstName | lastName | courseld |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| L0002345  | Jim       | Black    | C002     |
| L0001254  | James     | McCloud  | A004     |
| L0002349  | Peter     | Black    | C002     |
| L0001198  | Anne      | Null     | S042     |
| L0023487  | Peter     | Murray   | P301     |
| L0018453  | Anne      | Null     | S042     |

### b) Unique identification:

For every row, the value of the key must uniquely identify that row.



## Class Activity 5.2 (2 minutes)

# Explain the difference between candidate key and primary key.

**Answer:** A primary key is an attribute (or combination of attributes) that uniquely identifies a row in a relation. When a relation has more than one such attribute (or combination of attributes), each is called a candidate key. The primary key is then the one chosen by users to uniquely identify the rows in the relation.

# Determining Candidate Keys Using

# **Functional Dependencies (FDs)**

## **1.3. Determining Candidate Keys Using Functional Dependencies (FDs)**

The candidate keys of a relation R can be defined using given FD set of the relation.

To achieve this goal, the following concepts are discussed:

1.3.1. Attribute Closure

1.3.2. The Algorithm to Determine Candidate Keys Using FDs



## **1.3.1. Attribute Closure**

### > Attribute Closure:

Attribute closure of an attribute set can be defined as a set of attributes which can be functionally determined from it.

. . .

Given FD set of a Relation R, If A is an attribute (or a combination of attributes), the set of attributes in relation R that are **functionally** dependent on A is called <u>Attribute Closure</u> of A and it can be represented as  $A^+$ .

## > Steps to Find the Attribute Closure of A

Given FD set of a Relation R:

- 1- Add A to the attribute closure set of A (A+)
- 2- Recursively add attributes which can be functionally determined from attributes of the set A+ until done.

## **1.3.1. Example: Find the Attribute Closure of A**

R (<u>E-ID</u>, E-Name, E-City, E-State) FDs = { E-ID $\rightarrow$  E-Name, E-ID $\rightarrow$  E-City, E-City $\rightarrow$  E-State }

The attribute closure of E-ID can be calculated as:

1. Add E-ID to the set

 $(E-ID) + = \{E-ID\}$ 

- 2. Add Attributes which can be derived (functionally determined) from any attribute of set.
  - In this case, E-Name and E-City can be derived from E-ID.
  - In addition, E-State can be derived from E-City. So these are also a part of closure.

(E-ID)+ = {E-ID, E-Name, E-City, E-State }

Similarly:

(E-Name)+ = {E-Name} (E-City)+ = {E-City, E-State }

Reference: http://www.geeksforgeeks.org/finding-attribute-closure-and-candidate-keys-using-functional-dependencies/





Right

| Step 1: Collect all related FDs to the relation R |      |        |
|---|------|--------|
| Step 2: Create a table with three columns         | Left | Middle |
|   |      |        |

Step 3: Write all attributes that only show up <u>on the left side of some FDs under Left column</u> These attributes must be part of a key

- Step 4: Write all attributes that only show up <u>on the right side</u> of some FDs under **Right** column These attributes are not part of any key
- Step 5: Write all attributes that show up on both left and right sides of some FDs under Middle column These attributes may or may not be part of a key
- Step 6: Determine the closure of attributes under Left and Middle columns to find which combination of those attributes will functionally determine all other attributes. Start from attributes under Left column.
   Step 6.1. Add the attribute to the attribute closure set
   Step 6.2. Add Attributes which can be derived from any attribute of the attribute closure set.
- Step 7: The different combinations of attributes under Left and Middle columns that functionally determine all other attributes in relation R are keys for R i.e. If A+ =R then A is a candidate key for R

# 1.3.2. Example: Determining Candidate Keys Using FDs



Note: <u>Super Key is the combination of attributes under the Left and Middle columns</u> (in this example ABC is the super key).

#### **Step 6.1.** A+ ={A}

Step 6.2. A+ is not equal to R. Therefore, we need to add another attribute under Middle column and find the attribute closure of the combination of A and B:

AB+ ={AB} AB+ ={AB} and AB→C then AB+ = {ABC}

 $AB+ = \{ABC\} \text{ and } C \rightarrow D \text{ then } AB+ = \{ABCD\} = R$ 

We need to try other combinations of attributes under Left and Middle columns to find all possible candidate key. Similarly:

 $AC+ = \{ACBD\}$ 

Step 7: Determine the candidate keys:

<u>AB+ equals to R</u>. So AB is a candidate key for R.

<u>AC+ also equals to R</u>. So AC is another candidate key for R.

There are more examples presented in the related video that is uploaded on UTSonline in Week 5 folder.





Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani



### **Class Activity 5.3:** Determine the PK of the following relation (5 Minutes) First Create the Left/Middle/Right Table

INVOICE (OrderID, ProductID, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress, ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice, OrderQuantity)

➤ FDs:

OrderID, ProductID → OrderQuantity

ProductID 
ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice

OrderID → OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress

CustomerID  $\rightarrow$  CustomerName, CustomerAddress

| Left                 | Middle     | Right  |
|----------------------|------------|--|
| OrderID<br>ProductID | CustomerID | OrderQuantity<br>ProductDescription<br>ProductFinish<br>ProductStandardPrice<br>OrderDate<br>CustomerName<br>CustomerAddress |

Which attributes may be part of a candidate key?



| INVOICE (OrderID, ProductID, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress, | Left      | Middle     | Right                               |
|--|-----------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice, OrderQuantity)            | OrderID   | CustomerID | OrderQuantity                       |
| OrderID, ProductID -> OrderQuantity  | ProductiD |            | ProductDescription<br>ProductFinish |
| ProductID -> ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice               |           |            | ProductStandardPrice                |
| OrderID 🗲 OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress                     |           |            | CustomerName                        |
| CustomerID → CustomerName, CustomerAddress   |           |            | CustomerAddress                     |

#### Now we need to find all possible candidate keys

**OrderID+ =** {OrderID, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress}

ProductID+ = {ProductID, ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice}

{OrderID, ProductID}+ = {OrderID, ProductID, OrderQuantity, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName,

CustomerAddress, ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice} = INVOICE

**Note:** Considering that **{OrderID, ProductID}+ = INVOICE** we don't need to add another attribute to this combination to create a new candidate key. Because we are looking for minimal set of attributes to make a candidate key.

**(ProductID, CustomerID) +=** {CustomerID, ProductId, ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice, CustomerName, CustomerAddress}

{OrderID, CustomerID} += { OrderID, OrderDate, CustomerId, CustomerName, CustomerAddress, CustomerID}

Therefore "**OrderID**, **ProductID**" is the only composite candidate key and also the PK of the relation

# **Partial** and **Transitive** Functional Dependencies

# Partial and Transitive Functional Dependencies in a relation

cause the insertion, deletion and modification anomalies.

- What is **Partial** Functional Dependency?
- What is **Transitive** Functional Dependency?
- Why they cause the anomalies?



## 1.4. Partial Functional Dependencies (Book format)

A functional dependency in which one or more non-key attributes are functionally dependent on part (but not all) of the primary key (**Composite primary Key**).



Composite primary Key of this relation is: OrderID, ProductID
### **1.4. Partial Functional Dependencies** (Tutorial format)

A functional dependency in which one or more non-key attributes are functionally dependent on part (but not all) of the primary key (Composite primary Key).

INVOICE (<u>OrderID, ProductID</u>, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress, ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice, OrderQuantity)



OrderID, ProductID → OrderQuantity

**ProductID → ProductDescription**, **ProductFinish**, **ProductStandardPrice** 

OrderID → OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress

CustomerID → CustomerName, CustomerAddress

#### **Class Activity 5.4:** For the relation below:

- a) Find partial functional dependencies, and
- b) Explain if we need to check for partial functional dependencies in every relation.

C) Remove partial functional dependencies from the EMPLOYEE relation and provide new relations and the revised ERD.

EMPLOYEE (<u>Employee\_ID, Skill\_ID</u>, Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name, Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type, Date\_Completed)

FDs:

Employee\_ID --> Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name

Skill\_ID --> Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type

Company\_ID --> Com\_Name

Employee\_ID, Skill\_ID --> Date\_Completed

a) Considering the following FDs, there is a partial functional dependency in EMPLOYEE relation:

Employee\_ID --> Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name

Skill\_ID --> Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type

As you see, one or more non-key attributes are functionally dependent on part (but not all) of the primary key (Composite primary Key).

b) We just need to check the issue with partial functional dependency just for the relations with a **Composite** primary Key.

### 1.5. Transitive Functional Dependencies (Book format)

A functional dependency between the primary key and one or more non-key attributes that are dependent on the primary key via another non-key attribute.



Composite primary Key of this relation is: OrderID, ProductID





### **1.5. Transitive Functional Dependencies** (Tutorial format)

A functional dependency between the primary key and one or more non-key attributes that are dependent on the primary key via another non-key attribute.

INVOICE (OrderID, ProductID, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress,

ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice, OrderQuantity)

> FDs:

OrderID, ProductID  $\rightarrow$  OrderQuantity

ProductID → ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice

OrderID → OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress

CustomerID → CustomerName, CustomerAddress



#### **Class Activity 5.5:** For the relation below:

- a) Find transitive functional dependencies, and
- b) Explain if we need to check for transitive functional dependencies in every relation.

C) Remove transitive functional dependencies from the EMPLOYEE relation and provide new relations and the revised ERD.

EMPLOYEE (<u>Employee\_ID, Skill\_ID</u>, Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name, Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type, Date\_Completed)

#### FDs:

Employee\_ID --> Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name

Skill\_ID --> Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type

Company\_ID --> Com\_Name

Employee\_ID, Skill\_ID --> Date\_Completed

a) Considering the following FDs, there is a transitive functional dependency in EMPLOYEE relation:

Company\_ID --> Com\_Name

As you see, one or more non-key attributes that are dependent on the primary key via another non-key attribute.

b) We just need to check the issue with transitive functional dependency just for the relations with more than one dependent attributes.

### 1.6. Why Partial and Transitive FDS cause the anomalies?





## Have a look at the anomalies in INVOICE relation (table) that has partial and transitive FDs:

| OrderID | Order<br>Date | Customer<br>ID | Customer<br>Name     | Customer<br>Address | ProductID | Product<br>Description  | Product<br>Finish | Product<br>StandardPrice | Ordered<br>Quantity |
|---------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 7         | Dining<br>Table         | Natural<br>Ash    | 800.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 5         | Writer's<br>Desk        | Cherry            | 325.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 1                   |
| 1007    | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 11        | 4–Dr<br>Dresser         | Oak               | 500.00                   | 4                   |
| 1007    | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 3                   |

FIGURE 4-26 INVOICE relation (1NF) (Pine Valley Furniture Company)

- Insertion Anomaly: if new product is ordered for order 1007 of existing customer, customer data must be re-entered, causing duplication
- Deletion Anomaly : if we delete the Dining Table from Order 1006, we lose information concerning this item's finish and price
- > Update (Modification) Anomaly: changing the price of product ID 4 requires update in multiple records.

### Why do these anomalies exist?

Because there are **multiple themes** (entity types) in one relation. This results in duplication and an unnecessary dependency between the entities.

# Have a look at the relation (in two formats) and review the answer to "Why Partial and Transitive FDS cause the anomalies?"



INVOICE Relation

INVOICE (<u>OrderID, ProductID</u>, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress, ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice, OrderQuantity)

### Why do these anomalies exist?

Because there are multiple themes (entity types) in this relation. This results in data

duplication and an unnecessary dependency between the entities.

General rule of thumb: A table should not pertain to more than one entity type.



2. Well-Structured Relations and Data Normalization



- A relation that contains minimal data redundancy and allows users to insert, delete, and update rows without causing data inconsistencies
- Goal is to avoid anomalies
  - Insertion Anomaly: adding new rows forces user to create duplicate data
  - Deletion Anomaly: deleting rows may cause a loss of data that would be needed for other future rows
  - Modification (update) Anomaly: changing data in a row forces changes to other rows because of duplication

General rule of thumb: A table should not pertain to more than one entity type.



- Primarily a tool to validate and improve a logical design so that it satisfies certain constraints that avoid unnecessary duplication of data
- The process of decomposing relations with anomalies to produce smaller, well-structured relations



### 3. Steps in Normalization (Figure 4.22)





#### Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

### The Process of Designing and Normalizing an ERD:



**NOTE:** considering that BCNF is optional to learn for this subject, we don't need to determine all candidate keys of the relations to complete the normalization process. If you want to check your relation to make sure it is also in BCNF, then you need to determine all candidate keys of the relations.

### NOTE: Please DO NOT use your ERD or Relations to determine FDs.



Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

# **First Normal Form**

### 4. First Normal Form

- I. No derived attribute (Derived attribute can be calculated or derived using some business rule from other attributes)
  - **Example:** In the following relation StuAge is a derived attribute and should be removed from the relation
    - Student(<u>StudentID</u>, StuDateOfBirth, **StuAge**, StuAddress)
    - Student(<u>StudentID</u>, StuDateOfBirth, StuAddress)

**II.** Every attribute value is atomic (Atomic attributes can't be divided into subparts)

- **Example:** In the following relation StuAddress is a non-atomic attribute and should be divided to smaller parts
  - Student(<u>StudentID</u>, StuDateOfBirth, **StuAddress**)

Student(<u>StudentID</u>, StuDateOfBirth, StuUnitNumber, StuStreet, StuSuburb, StuState)
 Note: in the following slides "Customer Address" has been ASSUMED as an atomic attribute.

### III. No multivalued attributes (Multivalued attributes can have more than one value at a time)

Based on this, a relation is in first normal form if:

- There are no repeating groups in the relation.
- A Primary key has been defined, which uniquely identifies each row in the relation
- **Example:** In the next slides

### Table with multivalued attributes, not in 1<sup>st</sup> normal form

- > Multivalued attributes: Attributes that can have more than one value at a time.
- > A relation is in first normal form (1NF) if:
  - There are no repeating groups in the relation.
  - A Primary key has been defined, which uniquely identifies each row in the relation

| OrderID | Order<br>Date | Customer<br>ID | Customer<br>Name     | Customer<br>Address | ProductID | Product<br>Description  | Product<br>Finish | Product<br>StandardPrice | Ordered<br>Quantity |
|---------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 7         | Dining<br>Table         | Natural<br>Ash    | 800.00                   | 2                   |
|         |               |                |                      |                     | 5         | Writer's<br>Desk        | Cherry            | 325.00                   | 2                   |
|         |               |                |                      |                     | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 1                   |
| 1007    | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 11        | 4–Dr<br>Dresser         | Oak               | 500.00                   | 4                   |
|         |               |                |                      |                     | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 3                   |

FIGURE 4-25 INVOICE data (Pine Valley Furniture Company)

### Note: This is NOT a relation.



#### Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

### Table with no multivalued attributes and unique rows, in 1<sup>st</sup> normal form (1NF)

| OrderID | Order<br>Date | Customer<br>ID | Customer<br>Name     | Customer<br>Address | ProductID | Product<br>Description  | Product<br>Finish | Product<br>StandardPrice | Ordered<br>Quantity |
|---------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 7         | Dining<br>Table         | Natural<br>Ash    | 800.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 5         | Writer's<br>Desk        | Cherry            | 325.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006    | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 1                   |
| 1007    | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 11        | 4–Dr<br>Dresser         | Oak               | 500.00                   | 4                   |
| 1007    | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 3                   |

FIGURE 4-26 INVOICE relation (1NF) (Pine Valley Furniture Company)

Note: This is a relation and is in 1NF, but not a well-structured one.





Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

### **Anomalies in this Table (Review)**

| <u>OrderID</u> | Order<br>Date | Customer<br>ID | Customer<br>Name     | Customer<br>Address | ProductID | Product<br>Description  | Product<br>Finish | Product<br>StandardPrice | Ordered<br>Quantity |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| 1006           | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 7         | Dining<br>Table         | Natural<br>Ash    | 800.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006           | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 5         | Writer's<br>Desk        | Cherry            | 325.00                   | 2                   |
| 1006           | 10/24/2010    | 2              | Value<br>Furniture   | Plano, TX           | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 1                   |
| 1007           | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 11        | 4–Dr<br>Dresser         | Oak               | 500.00                   | 4                   |
| 1007           | 10/25/2010    | 6              | Furniture<br>Gallery | Boulder,<br>CO      | 4         | Entertainment<br>Center | Natural<br>Maple  | 650.00                   | 3                   |

FIGURE 4-26 INVOICE relation (1NF) (Pine Valley Furniture Company)

- Insertion Anomaly: if new product is ordered for order 1007 of existing customer, customer data must be reentered, causing duplication
- Deletion Anomaly : if we delete the Dining Table from Order 1006, we lose information concerning this item's finish and price
- > Update (Modification) Anomaly: changing the price of product ID 4 requires update in multiple records.

### Why do these anomalies exist?

Because there are **multiple themes** (entity types) in one relation. This results in duplication and an unnecessary dependency between the entities.

# **Class Activity 5.6:** Find the anomalies in the following relation with Employee\_ID and Skill\_ID as the composite PK.

| Employee_ID | Emp_F_Name | Emp_L_Name | Emp_Date_Employed | Emp_DOB  | Company_ID | Com_Name | <u>Skill_ID</u> | Skill_Title  | Skill_Type | Date_Completed |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------------------|----------|------------|----------|-----------------|--------------|------------|----------------|
| 1123        | Sara       | Brown      | 1/1/2014          | 1/1/1985 | C12        | Google   | <b>B86</b>      | C++          | PL         | 2/5/2020       |
| 1123        | Sara       | Brown      | 1/1/2014          | 1/1/1985 | C12        | Google   | V25             | Visual Basic | PL         | 7/9/2019       |
| 1456        | Jake       | Cooper     | 5/8/2013          | 7/8/1990 | C12        | Google   | C55             | C#           | CL         | 5/6/2006       |
| 1456        | Jake       | Cooper     | 5/8/2013          | 7/8/1990 | C12        | Google   | A23             | Java         | PL         | 3/7/2020       |
| 1456        | Jake       | Cooper     | 5/8/2013          | 7/8/1990 | C12        | Google   | C45             | Python       | PL         | 4/6/2007       |
| 7892        | Fahimeh    | Ramezani   | 2/3/2013          | 8/7/1987 | C13        | IBM      | C45             | Python       | PL         | 8/9/2018       |
| 7892        | Fahimeh    | Ramezani   | 2/3/2013          | 8/7/1987 | C13        | IBM      | B86             | C++          | PL         | 7/4/2016       |
| 8764        | Ricky      | Romanous   | 2/3/2015          | 4/3/1982 | C14        | SAS      | B86             | C++          | PL         | 9/9/2009       |
| 8764        | Ricky      | Romanous   | 2/3/2015          | 4/3/1982 | C14        | SAS      | C55             | C#           | CL         | 12/1/2005      |

- Insertion Anomaly: if new product is ordered for employee 7892 working in existing company, company data must be re-entered, causing duplication
- Deletion Anomaly: if we delete Visual Basic from the list of skills related to employee 1123, we lose information concerning this skill's title and type.
- > Update (Modification) Anomaly: updating the skill type of skill ID C55 requires update in multiple records.

### **Class Activity 5.7:** Is the following relation in 1NF?

STAFF (<u>staffID</u>, staFName, staLName, staAddress, staGender, staPhone, staDOB, staAge, staSScale, staJType, staCSalary, staSDate, DocPager, DocSpecialty, NursePosition, StaffType)

STAFF is not in 1NF as we have a non-atomic attribute staAddress, and a drived attribute staAge.

Please be aware that the FKs should not be shown in the ERD ...

In the examples that are provided in the following slides, we have used the SQL server diagrams that have FKs included (we **did not** use the Crow's Foot notation)

# **Second Normal Form**

### **5. Second Normal Form**

### INF PLUS every non-key attribute is fully functionally dependent on the ENTIRE primary key

- Every non-key attribute must be defined by the entire key, not by only part of the key
- No partial functional dependencies

### > Solution:

- 1. Create new relation for each Primary Key (PK) and move non-key attributes that are only dependent on this PK.
- 2. Consider this PK as a Foreign Key (FK) in the original table (relation)



### Partial Functional Dependencies in INVOICE (Book and Tutorial Formats)



Based on the FDs there are partial functional dependencies in this relation  $\rightarrow$  Therefore, This Relation (INVOICE) is NOT in 2<sup>nd</sup> Normal Form

### Removing Partial Dependencies (using Book Format in Figure 4-28)

- 1. Create new relation for each Primary Key (PK) and move non-key attributes that are only dependent on this PK.
- 2. Consider this PK as a Foreign Key (FK) in the original table (relation)



Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

### Removing Partial Dependencies (using Tutorial Format for Relations)

- 1. Create new relation for each Primary Key (PK) and move non-key attributes that are only dependent on this PK.
- 2. Consider this PK as a Foreign Key (FK) in the original table (relation)



INVOICE (OrderID, ProductID, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName,

CustomerAddress, ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice,

**OrderQuantity** 

OrderID, ProductID → OrderQuantity

- **ProductID → ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice**
- OrderID → OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress
  CustomerID → CustomerName, CustomerAddress
- New Relations: Getting it into Second Normal Form

PRODUCT (ProductID, ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice) ORDER (OrderID, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress) ORDER-LINE (OrderID\*, ProductID\*, OrderQuantity) FK (OrderID) references ORDER

FK (ProductID) references PRODUCT

Note the FKs

Partial dependencies are removed, but there are still transitive dependencies in ORDER relation.



Dr. Danna (Fahimeh) Ramezani

#### **Class Activity 5.4:** For the relation below: a) Find partial functional dependencies, and b) Explain if we need to check for partial functional dependencies in every relation. C) Remove partial functional dependencies from the EMPLOYEE relation and provide new relations and the revised ERD. EMPLOYEE (Employee\_ID, Skill\_ID, Emp F Name, Emp L Name, Emp Date Employed, Emp DOB, Company ID, Com Name, Skill Title, Skill Type, Date Completed) EMPLOYEE Employee\_ID FDs: Skill\_ID Employee\_ID --> Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name Emp\_F\_Name Emp L Name Skill ID --> Skill Title, Skill Type Emp\_Date\_Employed Emp DOB Company ID Company ID --> Com Name Com\_Name Skill Title Employee ID, Skill ID --> Date Completed Skill Type Date Completed

EMPLOYEE (**Employee\_ID**, Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name)

SKILL (Skill\_ID, Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type)

EMPLOYEE\_SKILL (Employee\_ID\*, Skill\_ID\*, Date\_Completed)

FK (Employee\_ID) references EMPLOYEE FK (Skill\_ID) references SKILL

#### **Class Activity 5.4:** For the relation below:

- a) Find partial functional dependencies, and
- b) Explain if we need to check for partial functional dependencies in every relation.
- C) Remove partial functional dependencies from the EMPLOYEE relation and provide new relations and the revised ERD.

EMPLOYEE (<u>Employee\_ID</u>, Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name)

SKILL (**Skill\_ID**, Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type)

EMPLOYEE\_SKILL (<u>Employee\_ID\*, Skill\_ID\*</u>, Date\_Completed)



# **Third Normal Form**

### 6. Third Normal Form

- > 2NF PLUS no transitive dependencies (functional dependencies on non-primary-key attributes)
- Note: This is called transitive, because the primary key is a determinant for another attribute, which in turn is a determinant for a third.
- (If it is non-transitive then each non-key attribute is not dependent on, or a determinant for, any other non-key attributes).

### > Solution:

- 1. Non-key determinant with transitive dependencies go into a new table;
- 2. Non-key determinant becomes primary key in the new table, and
- 3. Stays as foreign key in the old table (relation)





### By now ...

### we have converted INVOICE relation to three new relations as follows:

| <u>OrderID</u> | ProductID | Ordered Qu | iantity C | RDERLI    | NE (3NF)                 |           |                     |
|----------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|---------------------|
| ProductID      | ProductD  | escription | ProductFi | nish (    | Product<br>StandardPrice | PRODUCT   | (3NF)               |
| OrderID        | OrderDate | CustomerID | Cus       | tomerNan  | ne Custom                | erAddress | CUSTOMERORDER (2NF) |
|                |           |            | Transiti  | ve Depend | dencies                  | 1         |                     |

OrderID, ProductID → OrderQuantity

**ProductID > ProductDescription, ProductFinish, ProductStandardPrice** 

OrderID → OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress

CustomerID  $\rightarrow$  CustomerName, CustomerAddress

You can see there is a transitive functional dependencies in ORDER relation.



### **Removing Transitive Dependencies** (Book Format in Figure 4-29)

### > Solution:

- 1. Non-key determinant with transitive dependencies go into a new table;
- 2. Non-key determinant becomes primary key in the new table, and
- 3. Stays as foreign key in the old table



### **Removing Transitive Dependencies** (Using Book Format in Figure 4-29)

- 1. Non-key determinant with transitive dependencies go into a new table;
- 2. Non-key determinant becomes primary key in the new table, and
- 3. Stays as foreign key in the old table



### Removing Transitive Dependencies (Using Tutorial Format for Relations)

- 1. Non-key determinant with transitive dependencies go into a new table;
- 2. Non-key determinant becomes primary key in the new table, and
- 3. Stays as foreign key in the old table

**ORDER** (OrderID, OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress)

### > FDs:

OrderID → OrderDate, CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress

CustomerID → CustomerName, CustomerAddress

### > New Relations that are in 3NF:

CUSTOMER (CustomerID, CustomerName, CustomerAddress)

ORDER (<u>OrderID</u>, OrderDate, CustomerID\*) FK (CustomerID) references CUSTOMER  $\checkmark$ 

#### ORDER

| OrderID | OrderDate  | CustomerID |
|---------|------------|------------|
| 1001    | 18/04/1983 | 1233       |
| 1003    | 12/01/1988 | 1233       |
|         |            |            |



### **Normalized logical Design**



#### **Class Activity 5.5:** For the relation below:

- a) Find transitive functional dependencies, and
- b) Explain if we need to check for transitive functional dependencies in every relation.

C) Remove transitive functional dependencies from the EMPLOYEE relation and provide new relations and the revised ERD.

EMPLOYEE (<u>Employee\_ID, Skill\_ID</u>, Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name, Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type, Date\_Completed)

#### FDs:

Employee\_ID --> Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name

Skill\_ID --> Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type

Company\_ID --> Com\_Name

Employee\_ID, Skill\_ID --> Date\_Completed

EMPLOYEE (Employee\_ID, Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID, Com\_Name)

EMPLOYEE (Employee\_ID, Emp\_F\_Name, Emp\_L\_Name, Emp\_Date\_Employed, Emp\_DOB, Company\_ID\*)

FK (Company\_ID) references COMPANY

COMPANY (Company\_ID, Com\_Name)
## **Class Activity 5.5:** For the relation below:

- a) Find transitive functional dependencies, and
- b) Explain if we need to check for transitive functional dependencies in every relation.
- C) Remove transitive functional dependencies from the EMPLOYEE relation and provide new relations and the revised ERD.



COMPANY (Company\_ID, Com\_Name)

SKILL (**Skill\_ID**, Skill\_Title, Skill\_Type)

EMPLOYEE\_SKILL (Employee\_ID\*, Skill\_ID\*, Date\_Completed)

FK (Employee ID) references EMPLOYEE





- State two properties of candidate keys
- > Determining keys from FDs
- > Define first, second, and third normal form
- Use normalization to decompose anomalous relations to well-structured relations



## Next Lecture...

- 1. Review of 1NF, 2NF and 3NF.
- 2. Boyce Codd Normal Form (BCNF) → Optional
  - 1.1. BCNF Example 1
  - 1.2. BCNF Example 2
- 3. Creating New Relations in a Higher Normal Form  $\rightarrow$  Optional
- 4. Role of Normalization  $\rightarrow$  Optional
- 5. Advantages of Refinement (Top-Down) Approach  $\rightarrow$  Optional
- 6. Tutorial 6 Section one





## Copyright © 2013 Pearson Education