

Boyce–Codd Normal Form (BCNF)

- A relation $R(X)$ is in *Boyce–Codd Normal Form* if for every non-trivial functional dependency $Y \rightarrow Z$ defined on it, Y contains a key K of $R(X)$. That is, Y is a superkey for $R(X)$.
- Example: $\text{Person1}(SI\#, Name, Address)$
 - ✓ The only FD is $SI\# \rightarrow Name, Address$
 - ✓ Since $SI\#$ is a key, Person1 is in BCNF
- Anomalies and redundancies, as discussed earlier, do not occur in databases with relations in BCNF.

CSC343 – Introduction to Databases

Normal Forms — 1

Non-BCNF Examples

- $\text{Person}(SI\#, Name, Address, Hobby)$
 - ✓ The FD $SI\# \rightarrow Name, Address$ does *not* satisfy conditions for BCNF since the key is $\{SSN, Hobby\}$
- $\text{HasAccount}(AcctNum, ClientId, OfficeId)$
 - ✓ The FD $AcctNum \rightarrow OfficeId$ does *not* satisfy BCNF conditions if we assume that keys for HasAccount are $\{ClientId, OfficeId\}$ and $\{AcctNum, ClientId\}$, rather than $AcctNum$.

CSC343 – Introduction to Databases

Normal Forms — 2

A Relation not in BCNF

Manager	Project	Branch
Brown	Mars	Chicago
Green	Jupiter	Birmingham
Green	Mars	Birmingham
Hoskins	Saturn	Birmingham
Hoskins	Venus	Birmingham

Assume the following dependencies:

- Manager → Branch — each manager works in a particular branch;
- Project, Branch → Manager — each project has several managers, and runs on several branches; however, a project has a unique manager for each branch.

A Problematic Decomposition

- The relation is not in BCNF because the left hand side of the first dependency is not a superkey.
- At the same time, no decomposition of this relation will work: **Project, Branch** → **Manager** involves all the attributes and thus no decomposition is possible.
- Sometimes BCNF *cannot* be achieved for a particular relation and set of functional dependencies without violating the principles of lossless decomposition and dependency preservation.

Normalization Drawbacks

- By limiting redundancy, normalization helps maintain consistency and saves space.
- *But* performance of querying can suffer because related information that was stored in a single relation is now distributed among several
- Example: A join is required to get the names and grades of all students taking CS343 in 2007F.

Student(<u>Id</u> , Name) Transcript(<u>StudId</u> , <u>CrsCode</u> , <u>Sem</u> , Grade)
--

```
SELECT S.Name, T.Grade
FROM Student S, Transcript T
WHERE S.Id = T.StudId AND
      T.CrsCode = 'CS343' AND T.Sem = '2007F'
```

Denormalization

- Tradeoff: *Judiciously* introduce redundancy to improve performance of certain queries
- Example: Add attribute *Name* to **Transcript** → **Transcript'**

```
SELECT T.Name, T.Grade
FROM Transcript' T
WHERE T.CrsCode = 'CS305' AND T.Sem = 'S2002'
```

- ✓ Join is avoided;
- ✓ If queries are asked more frequently than **Transcript** is modified, added redundancy might improve average performance;
- ✓ But, **Transcript'** is no longer in BCNF since key is {*StudId*, *CrsCode*, *Sem*} and *StudId* → *Name*.

BCNF and 3NF

- The Project-Branch-Manager schema is not in BCNF, but it *is* in 3NF.
- In particular, the **Project, Branch** → **Manager** dependency has as its left hand side a key, while **Manager** → **Branch** has a unique attribute for the right hand side, which is part of the {**Project, Branch**} key.
- The 3NF is less restrictive than the BCNF and for this reason does not offer the same guarantees of quality for a relation; it has the advantage however, of *always* being achievable.