# Week 2 - Part II <br> Relational Algebra 

Querying and Updating a Database<br>The Relational Algebra<br>Union, Intersection, Difference<br>Renaming, Selection and Projection Join, Cartesian Product

## Query Languages for Relational Databases

$\rightarrow$ Operations on databases:
$\checkmark$ Queries - read data from the database;
$\checkmark$ Updates - change the content of the database.
$\rightarrow$ In this lecture unit we discuss the relational algebra, a procedural language that defines database operations in terms of algebraic expressions.
$\rightarrow$ [The Relational Calculus is a declarative language for database operations based on Predicate Logic; we will not discuss it here.]

## Relational Algebra

$\rightarrow$ A collection of algebraic operators that
$\checkmark$ Are defined on relations;
$\checkmark$ Produce relations as results, and therefore can be combined to form complex algebraic expressions.
Operators:
$\checkmark$ Union, intersection, difference;
$\checkmark$ Renaming;
$\checkmark$ Selection and Projection;
$\checkmark$ Join (natural join, Cartesian product, theta join).
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## Union, Intersection, Difference

$\rightarrow$ Relations are sets, so we can apply set-theoretic operators
$\rightarrow$ However, we want the results to be relations (that is, homogeneous sets of tuples)
$\rightarrow$ It is therefore meaningful to only apply union, intersection, difference to pairs of relations defined over the same attributes.

## Union

| Graduates |  |  | Graduates $\cup$ Managers |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | Surname | Age |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7274 \\ & 7432 \\ & 9824 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Robinson O'Malley Darkes | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \\ & 39 \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number | Surname | Age |
| Managers |  |  | 7274 | Robinson | 37 |
|  |  |  | 7432 | O'Malley | 39 |
|  |  |  | 9824 | Darkes | 38 |
| Number | Surname | Age | 9297 | O'Malley | 56 |
| 9297 | O'Malley | 56 |  |  |  |
| 7432 | O'Malley | 39 |  |  |  |
| 9824 | Darkes | 38 |  |  |  |

## Intersection

## Graduates

| Number | Surname | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7274 | Robinson | 37 |
| 7432 | O'Malley | 39 |
| 9824 | Darkes | 38 |

Managers

| Number | Surname | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9297 | O'Malley | 56 |
| 7432 | O'Malley | 39 |
| 9824 | Darkes | 38 |

Graduates $\cap$ Managers

| Number | Surname | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7432 | O'Malley | 39 |
| 9824 | Darkes | 38 |

## Difference

Graduates

| Number | Surname | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7274 | Robinson | 37 |
| 7432 | O'Malley | 39 |
| 9824 | Darkes | 38 |

Managers
Graduates - Managers

| Number | Surname | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7274 | Robinson | 37 |


| Number | Surname | Age |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9297 | O'Malley | 56 |
| 7432 | O'Malley | 39 |
| 9824 | Darkes | 38 |

## A Meaningful but Impossible Union

Paternity

| Father | Child |
| :---: | :---: |
| Adam | Cain |
| Adam | Abel |
| Abraham | Isaac |
| Abraham | Ishmael |

Maternity

| Mother | Child |
| :---: | :---: |
| Eve | Cain |
| Eve | Seth |
| Sarah | Isaac |
| Hagar | Ishmael |

Paternity $\cup$ Maternity ???
$\rightarrow$ The problem: Father and Mother are different names, but both represent a parent.
$\rightarrow$ The solution: rename attributes!

## Renaming

$\rightarrow$ This is a unary operator which changes attribute names for a relation without changing any values.
$\rightarrow$ Renaming removes the limitations associated with set operators.
$\rightarrow$ Notation: $\rho$ oldName $\rightarrow$ NewName $(\mathbf{r})$
$\rightarrow$ For example, $\rho_{\text {Father } \rightarrow \text { Parent }}$ (Paternity)
$\rightarrow$ If there are two or more attributes involved in a renaming operation, then ordering is meaningful:
e.g., $\rho_{\text {Branch,Salary } \rightarrow \text { Location,Pay }}$ (Employees)

## Example of Renaming

Paternity

| Father | Child |
| :---: | :---: |
| Adam | Cain |
| Adam | Abel |
| Abraham | Isaac |
| Abraham | Ishmael |

$\rho_{\text {Father }->\text { Parent }}$ (Paternity)

| Parent | Child |
| :---: | :---: |
| Adam | Cain |
| Adam | Abel |
| Abraham | Isaac |
| Abraham | Ishmael |

- The textbook allows positions rather than attribute names, e.g., $1 \rightarrow$ Parent
- Textbook also allows renaming of the relation itself,e.g.,Paternity, 1 $\rightarrow$ Parenthood, Parent


## Renaming and Union

Paternity

| Father | Child |
| :---: | :---: |
| Adam | Cain |
| Adam | Abel |
| Abraham | Isaac |
| Abraham | Ishmael |

Maternity

| Mother | Child |
| :---: | :---: |
| Eve | Cain |
| Eve | Seth |
| Sarah | Isaac |
| Hagar | Ishmael |

$\rho_{\text {Father->Parent }}$ (Paternity) $\cup \rho_{\text {Mother->Parent }}$ (Maternity)

| Parent | Child |
| :---: | :---: |
| Adam | Cain |
| Adam | Abel |
| Abraham | Isaac |
| Abraham | Ishmael |
| Eve | Cain |
| Eve | Seth |
| Sarah | Isaac |
| Hagar | Ishmael |

# Renaming and Union, with Several Attributes 

Employees

| Surname | Branch | Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Patterson | Rome | 45 |
| Trumble | London | 53 |

Staff

| Surname | Factory | Wages |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Patterson | Rome | 45 |
| Trumble | London | 53 |

$\rho_{\text {Branch,Salary } \rightarrow \text { Location,Pay }}$ (Employees) $\cup \rho_{\text {Factory, Wages } \rightarrow \text { Lo }}$

| Surname | Location | Pay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Patterson | Rome | 45 |
| Trumble | London | 53 |
| Cooke | Chicago | 33 |
| Bush | Monza | 32 |

## Selection and Projection

$\rightarrow$ These are unary operators, in a sense orthogonal:
$\checkmark$ selection for "horizontal" decompositions;
$\checkmark$ projection for "vertical" decompositions.


## Selection

$\rightarrow$ This is a unary operation which returns a relation
$\checkmark$ with the same schema as the operand;
$\checkmark$ but, with a subset of the tuples of the operand, i.e., only those that satisfy a condition.
$\rightarrow$ Notation: $\sigma_{\mathrm{F}}(\mathbf{r})$
$\rightarrow$ Semantics: $\sigma_{F}(\mathbf{r})=\{\mathbf{t} \mid \mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{r}$ s.t. $\mathbf{t}$ satisfies $F$, I.e., $F(\mathbf{t})\}$

## Selection Example

## Employees

| Surname | FirstName | Age | Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | Mary | 25 | 2000 |
| Black | Lucy | 40 | 3000 |
| Verdi | Nico | 36 | 4500 |
| Smith | Mark | 40 | 3900 |

$\sigma$ Age $<30$ v Salary $>4000$ (Employees)

| Surname | FirstName | Age | Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | Mary | 25 | 2000 |
| Verdi | Nico | 36 | 4500 |

## Selection, Another Example

## Citizens

| Surname | FirstName | PlaceOfBirth | Residence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | Mary | Rome | Milan |
| Black | Lucy | Rome | Rome |
| Verdi | Nico | Florence | Florence |
| Smith | Mark | Naples | Florence |

$\sigma_{\text {PlaceOfBirth=Residence }}$ (Citizens)

| Surname | FirstName | PlaceOfBirth | Residence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black | Lucy | Rome | Rome |
| Verdi | Nico | Florence | Florence |

## Projection

# $\rightarrow$ Projection returns a relation which includes a subset of the attributes of the operand. <br> $\rightarrow$ Notation: Given a relation $r(X)$ and a subset $Y$ of $X$ : <br> $\pi_{\mathrm{Y}}(\mathrm{r})$ <br> $\rightarrow$ Semantics: $\quad \pi_{Y}(r)=\{t[Y] \mid t \in r\}$ 

## Example of Projection

## Employees

| Surname | FirstName | Department | Head |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | Mary | Sales | De Rossi |
| Black | Lucy | Sales | De Rossi |
| Verdi | Mary | Personnel | Fox |
| Smith | Mark | Personnel | Fox |

$\pi_{\text {Surname, FirstName }}$ (Employees)

| Surname | FirstName |
| :---: | :---: |
| Smith | Mary |
| Black | Lucy |
| Verdi | Mary |
| Smith | Mark |

## Another Example

Employees

| Surname | FirstName | Department | Head |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | Mary | Sales | De Rossi |
| Black | Lucy | Sales | De Rossi |
| Verdi | Mary | Personnel | Fox |
| Smith | Mark | Personnel | Fox |

$\pi_{\text {Department, Head }}$ (Employees)

| Department | Head |
| :---: | :---: |
| Sales | De Rossi |
| Personnel | Fox |

## Cardinality of Projection Operations

$\rightarrow$ Note that the result of a projection contains at most as many tuples as the operand relation.
$\rightarrow$ However, it may contain fewer, if several tuples collapse, i.e., they are identical in all their values.
$\rightarrow$ Theorem: $\pi_{Y}(r)$ contains as many tuples as $r$ if and only if Y is a superkey for r .
$\rightarrow$ This property holds even if Y is "by chance" a superkey, i.e., it is not defined as a superkey in the schema, but it is a superkey for the current database, see the example.

## Tuples that Collapse

## Students

| RegNum | Surname | FirstName | BirthDate | DegreeProg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 284328 | Smith | Luigi | $29 / 04 / 59$ | Computing |
| 296328 | Smith | John | $29 / 04 / 59$ | Computing |
| 587614 | Smith | Lucy | $01 / 05 / 61$ | Engineering |
| 934856 | Black | Lucy | $01 / 05 / 61$ | Fine Art |
| 965536 | Black | Lucy | $05 / 03 / 58$ | Fine Art |

$\pi_{\text {Surname, DegreeProg }}$ (Students)

| Surname | DegreeProg |
| :---: | :---: |
| Smith | Computing |
| Smith | Engineering |
| Black | Fine Art |

## Tuples that do not Collapse, "by Chance"

## Students

| RegNum | Surname | FirstName | BirthDate | DegreeProg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 296328 | Smith | John | $29 / 04 / 59$ | Computing |
| 587614 | Smith | Lucy | $01 / 05 / 61$ | Engineering |
| 934856 | Black | Lucy | $01 / 05 / 61$ | Fine Art |
| 965536 | Black | Lucy | $05 / 03 / 58$ | Engineering |

$\pi_{\text {Surname, DegreeProg }}$ (Students)

| Surname | DegreeProg |
| :---: | :---: |
| Smith | Computing |
| Smith | Engineering |
| Black | Fine Art |
| Black | Engineering |

## Join

$\rightarrow$ The most used operator in the relational algebra.
$\rightarrow$ Allows us to establish connections among data in different relations, taking advantage of the "valuebased" nature of the relational model.
$\rightarrow$ Two main versions of the join:
$\checkmark$ "natural" join: takes attribute names into account; $\checkmark$ "theta" join.
$\rightarrow$ Both join operations are denoted by the symbol $\bowtie$.

## A Natural Join


$r_{2}$

| $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{1}} \bowtie \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- |
| Employee |
| Smith |
| Department |
| Black |
| sales |
| Whoduction |
| White | Brown | Mori |
| :---: |


| Department | Head |
| :---: | :---: |
| production <br> sales | Mori |
| Brown |  |

## Definition of Natural Join

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow r_{1}\left(X_{1}\right), r_{2}\left(X_{2}\right) \\
& \left.\rightarrow r_{1} \bowtie r_{2} \text { (natural join of } r_{1} \text { and } r_{2}\right) \text { is a relation on } \\
& X_{1} X_{2} \text { (the union of the two sets): } \\
& \quad\left\{t \text { on } X_{1} X_{2} \mid t\left[X_{1}\right] \in r_{1} \text { and } t\left[X_{2}\right] \in r_{2}\right\} \\
& \text { or, equivalently } \\
& \text { \{t on } X_{1} X_{2} \mid \text { exist } t_{1} \in r_{1} \text { and } t_{2} \in r_{2} \text { with } t\left[X_{1}\right]=t_{1} \\
& \left.\qquad \quad \text { and } t\left[X_{2}\right]=t_{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Natural Join: Comments

$\rightarrow$ The tuples in the resulting relation are obtained by combining tuples in the operands with equal values on the common attributes
$\rightarrow$ The common attributes often form a key of one of the operands (remember: references are realized by means of foreign keys, and we join in order to follow references)

* Not always! Consider Person(Name,Addr,PostalC) and let us define Neighbour(Name,Addr,Name1,Addr1,PostalC)
by joining Person with $\rho_{\text {Name,Addr } \rightarrow \text { Name 1,Addr1 }}$ (Person); What is criterion for neighbourhood here?


## Another Example

Offences | Code | Date | Officer | Dept | Registartion |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 143256 | $25 / 10 / 1992$ | 567 | 75 | 5694 FR |
|  | 987554 | $26 / 10 / 1992$ | 456 | 75 | 5694 FR |
|  | 987557 | $26 / 10 / 1992$ | 456 | 75 | 6544 XY |
|  | 630876 | $15 / 10 / 1992$ | 456 | 47 | 6544 XY |
|  | 539856 | $12 / 10 / 1992$ | 567 | 47 | 6544 XY |

Cars | Registration |  |  |  |  | Dept | Owner | $\ldots$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6544 XY | 75 | Cordon Edouard |  |  |  |  |
| 7122 HT | 75 | Cordon Edouard | $\ldots$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5694 FR | 75 | Latour Hortense |  |  |  |  |
| 6544 XY | 47 | Mimault Bernard | $\ldots$ |  |  |  |  |

Offences $\bowtie$ Cars

| Code | Date | Officer | Dept | Registration | Owner |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 143256 | 25/10/1992 | 567 | 75 | 5694 FR | Latour Hortense |  |
| 987554 | 26/10/1992 | 456 | 75 | 5694 FR | Latour Hortense | $\ldots$ |
| 987557 | 26/10/1992 | 456 | 75 | 6544 XY | Cordon Edouard | $\ldots$ |
| 630876 | 15/10/1992 | 456 | 47 | 6544 XY | Cordon Edouard | $\ldots$ |
| 539856 | 12/10/1992 | 567 | 47 | 6544 XY | Mimault Bernard | $\ldots$ |

## Yet Another Join

## $\rightarrow$ In this example, join gives very different results from union (see earlier example)

## Paternity

| Father | Child |
| :---: | :---: |
| Adam | Cain |
| Adam | Abel |
| Abraham | Isaac |
| Abraham | Ishmael |

Maternity

| Mother | Child |
| :---: | :---: |
| Eve | Cain |
| Eve | Seth |
| Sarah | Isaac |
| Hagar | Ishmael |

Paternity $\bowtie$ Maternity

| Father | Child | Mother |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adam | Cain | Eve |
| Abraham | Isaac | Sarah |
| Abraham | Ishmael | Hagar |

## Joins can be Incomplete

$\rightarrow$ If a tuple does not have a "counterpart" in the other relation, then it does not contribute to the join ("dangling" tuple)


| Smith | sales |
| :---: | :---: |
| Black | production |
| White | production |


| Department | Head |
| :---: | :---: |
| production <br> purchasing | Mori |
| Brown |  |

$r_{1} \bowtie r_{2}$

| Employee | Department | Head |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Black | production | Mori |
| White | production | Mori |
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## Joins can be Empty

$\rightarrow$ As an extreme, we might have that no tuple has a counterpart, and all tuples are dangling


## Another Extreme

$\rightarrow$ If each tuple of each operand can be combined with all the tuples of the other, then the join has a cardinality that is the product of the cardinalities of the operands
$r_{1}$

| Employee | Project |
| :---: | :---: |
| Smith | A |
| Black | A |
| White | A |


$\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{1}} \pitchfork \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{2}}$

| Employee | Project | Head |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | A | Mori |
| Black | A | Brown |
| White | A | Mori |
| Smith | A | Brown |
| Black | A | Mori |
| White | A | Brown |

## How Many Tuples in a Join?

$\rightarrow$ Given $r_{1}\left(X_{1}\right), r_{2}\left(X_{2}\right)$ the join has cardinality

$$
0 \leq\left|r_{1} \bowtie r_{2}\right| \leq\left|r_{1}\right| \times\left|r_{2}\right|
$$

where $|r|$ is the cardinality of relation $r$.
$\rightarrow$ Moreover:
$\checkmark$ if the join is complete, then its cardinality is at least the maximum of $\left|r_{1}\right|$ and $\left|r_{2}\right|$.
$\checkmark$ if $X_{1} \cap X_{2}$ contains a key for $r_{2}$,
then $\left|r_{1} \bowtie r_{2}\right| \leq\left|r_{1}\right|$
$\checkmark$ if $X_{1} \cap X_{2}$ is the primary key for $r_{2}$, and there is a referential constraint between $X_{1} \cap X_{2}$ in $r_{1}$ and such a key, then $\left|r_{1} \bowtie r_{2}\right|=\left|r_{1}\right|$.

## Outer Join

$\rightarrow$ A variant of the join, to keep all pieces of information from the operands.
$\rightarrow$ An outer join operation "pads with nulls" the tuples in one operant relation that have no counterpart in the other relation.
$\rightarrow$ Three variants:
$\checkmark$ LEFT - only tuples of left operand are padded;
$\checkmark$ RIGHT - only tuples of right operand are padded;
$\checkmark$ FULL - tuples of both operands are padded.

## Outer Join Operations



| $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{1}} \bowtie_{\text {LEFT }} \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Employee | Department | Head |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Smith | Sales | NULL |
| Black | production | Mori |  |
| White | production | Mori |  |


|  | Employee | Department | Head |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Black | production | Mori |
| $\mathrm{r}_{1} \bowtie$ RIGHT ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | White | production | Mori |


| $\mathrm{r}_{1} \bigotimes_{\text {FULL }} \mathrm{r}_{2}$ | Employee | Department | Head |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Smith | Sales | NULL |
|  | Black | production | Mori |
|  | White | production | Mori |
|  | NULL | purchasing | Brown |

## N -ary Join Operations

$\rightarrow$ The natural join is
$\checkmark$ commutative: $r_{1} \bowtie r_{2}=r_{2} \bowtie r_{1}$ $\checkmark$ associative: $\left(r_{1} \bowtie r_{2}\right) \bowtie r_{3}=r_{1} \bowtie\left(r_{2} \bowtie r_{3}\right)$
$\rightarrow$ Therefore, we can write n-ary joins without ambiguity:

$$
r_{1} \bowtie r_{2} \bowtie \ldots \bowtie r_{n}
$$

## Example of $\mathbf{N}$-ary Join Operation

| $\boldsymbol{r}_{1}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Employee | Department |
| Smith | sales |
| Black | production |
| Brown | marketing |
| White | production |


$r_{3}$

| Division | Head |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | Mori |
| B | Brown |


| $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{1}} \bowtie \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{2}} \bowtie \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{3}}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employee | Department | Division | Head |
| Black | production | A | Mori |
| Brown | marketing | B | Brown |
| White | production | A | Mori |

## Join and Intersection

$\rightarrow$ We have made no assumptions about the sets of attributes $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$ on which the operands of a join operation are defined; the two sets could even be equal or disjoint.
$\rightarrow$ If $X_{1}=X_{2}$ then $r_{1} \bowtie r_{2}=r_{1} \cap r_{2}$ since, by definition, the result is a relation which includes tuples $t$ such that $t\left[X_{1}\right] \in r_{1}$ and $t\left[X_{2}\right] \in r_{2}$, and $X_{1}=X_{2}$.

## Natural Join as Cartesian Product

$\rightarrow$ The natural join is defined also when the operands have no attributes in common.
$\rightarrow$ In this case no condition is imposed on tuples, and therefore the result contains tuples obtained by combining the tuples of the operands in all possible ways.

## Cartesian Product: Example

## Employees

| Employee | Project |
| :---: | :---: |
| Smith | A |
| Black | A |
| Black | B |

Projects

| Code | Name |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | Venus |
| B | Mars |

## Employes $\bowtie$ Projects

| Employee | Project | Code | Name |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | A | A | Venus |
| Black | A | A | Venus |
| Black | B | A | Venus |
| Smith | A | B | Mars |
| Black | A | B | Mars |
| Black | B | B | Mars |

## Theta-Join

$\rightarrow$ In most cases, a Cartesian product is meaningful only if followed by a selection:
$\checkmark$ theta-join: a derived operator

$$
r_{1} \bowtie{ }_{F} r_{2}=\sigma_{F}\left(r_{1} \bowtie r_{2}\right)
$$

$\checkmark$ if $F$ is a conjunction of equalities, then we have an equi-join

## Equi-join: example

## Employees

| Employee | Project |
| :---: | :---: |
| Smith | A |
| Black | A |
| Black | B |$\quad$|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Projects |
| Code | Name |
| A | Venus |
| B | Mars |

Employes $\bowtie_{\text {Project=Code }}$ Projects

| Employee | Project | Code | Name |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smith | A | A | Venus |
| Black | A | A | Venus |
| Black | B | B | Mars |

## Division

$\rightarrow$ Consider two relations $A(x, y), B(y)$ and suppose we want to specify the query
"Find all A's that are associated with all B's"
$\rightarrow$ This can be expressed as

$$
\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B}=\pi_{\mathrm{x}}(\mathrm{~A})-\pi_{\mathrm{x}}\left(\left(\pi_{\mathrm{x}}(\mathrm{~A}) \bowtie \mathrm{B}\right)-\mathrm{A}\right)
$$

$\rightarrow$ This means that division does not extend the expressiveness of Relational Algebra, but it is a convenient operation to use in many situations.

## Example of Division

$\rightarrow$ Assume
$\checkmark$ Take( $x, y$ ) - "student $x$ has taken course $y "$,
$\checkmark$ CS(y) - " $y$ is a CS course"
$\rightarrow$ We want "All students who have taken all CS courses"

$$
\checkmark \pi_{\mathrm{x}}(\text { Take }) \bowtie \mathrm{CS}--?
$$

$$
\checkmark\left(\pi_{\mathrm{x}}(\text { Take }) \bowtie \mathrm{CS}\right)-\text { Take -- ?? }
$$

$$
\checkmark \pi_{x}\left(\left(\pi_{x}(\text { Take }) \bowtie \mathrm{CS}\right)-\text { Take }\right)-\text { ??? }
$$

$$
\checkmark \pi_{x}(\text { Take })-\pi_{x}\left(\left(\pi_{x}(\text { Take }) \bowtie \mathrm{CS}\right)-\text { Take }\right)-\text { ? ??? }
$$

## Queries

$\rightarrow$ A query is a function from database instances to relations.
$\rightarrow$ Queries are formulated in relational algebra by means of expressions over relations.

## A Sample Database



## Example 1

"Find the numbers, names and ages of employees earning more than 40k."

Employees(Number,Name,Age,Salary)
Supervision(Head,Emp)
Try it!

## Example 2

$\rightarrow$ "Find the registration numbers of the supervisors of the employees earning more than 40M."

Employees(Number,Name,Age,Salary)
Supervision(Head,Emp)


## Example 3

$\rightarrow$ "Find the names and salaries of the supervisors of the employees earning more than 40M."

Employees(Number,Name,Age,Salary)
Supervision(Head,Emp)
Try it! (this is a bit tougher)

## Example 4

$\rightarrow$ "Find the employees earning more than their respective supervisors, return registration numbers, names and salaries of the employees and their supervisors."

Employees(Number,Name,Age,Salary)
Supervision(Head,Emp)
Try it! Definitely challenging ©

## Example 5

$\rightarrow$ "Find registration numbers and names of supervisors, all of whose employees earn more than 40M."

Employees(Number,Name,Age,Salary)
Supervision(Head,Emp)


## Another Series of Examples:

Films(Film\#,Title,Director,Year,ProdCost)Artists(Actor\#,Surname,FirsName,Sex,Birthday,Nationality)
Roles(Film\#,Actor\#,Character)
$\rightarrow$ Find "The titles of films starring Henry Fonda

| Try it! |
| :---: |
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## Example 2

Films(Film\#,Title,Director,Year,ProdCost)
Artists(Actor\#,Surname,FirsName,Sex,Birthday, Nationality)

## Roles(Film\#,Actor\#,Character)

$\rightarrow$ Find "The titles of all films in which the director is also an actor"

Try it!

## Example 3

Films(Film\#,Title,Director,Year,ProdCost)
Artists(Actor\#,Surname,FirsName,Sex,Birthday, Nationality)

## Roles(Film\#,Actor\#,Character)

$\rightarrow$ Find "The actors who have played two characters in the same film; show the title of each such film, first name and surname of the actor and the two characters"

## Try it!
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## Example 4

## Films(Film\#,Title,Director,Year,ProdCost)

Artists(Actor\#,Surname,FirsName,Sex,Birthday, Nationality)

## Roles(Film\#,Actor\#,Character)

$\rightarrow$ "The titles of the films in which the actors are all of the same sex"

Try it!

# Relational Algebra and Null Values 

People | Name | Age | Salary |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Aldo | 35 |
| 15 |  |  |
| Andrea | 27 | 21 |
| Maria | NULL | 42 |

$\rightarrow$ Consider $\sigma_{\text {Age }>30}$ (People)
$\rightarrow$ Which tuples belong to the result?
$\rightarrow$ The first yes, the second no, but the third??

# Lecture Example (for blackboard) 

## Blackboard Example II

