

## 01: Closure of a Set of FDs

```
F+ = {  
  // A1 triviality  
  A→A, B→B, C→C,  
  AB→A, AB→B, AB→AB, AC→A, AC→C, AC→AC, BC→B, BC→C, BC→BC,  
  ABC→A, ABC→B, ABC→C, ABC→AB, ABC→AC, ABC→BC, ABC→ABC,  
  // Assumptions  
  A→B,  
  // A3 composition  
  A→AB,  
  // A2 transitivity  
  AC→B,  
  // A3 composition  
  AC→AB, AC→BC, AC→ABC  
}
```

---

## 02: Cover of a Set of FDs

```
F = {  
  A→C, // F1  
  BC→D, // F2  
  C→E, // F3  
  E→A // F4  
}  
G = {  
  A→CE, // G1  
  C→A, // G2  
  E→AE, // G3  
  AB→D // G4  
}
```

Successful derivation of dependency G1 ( $A \rightarrow CE$ ) using all the dependencies in F

```
R1: A→C (F1)  
R2: C→E (F3)  
R3: A→E (R1, R2, A2 transitivity)  
R4: A→CE (R1, R3, A3 composition)
```

Successful derivation of dependency G2 ( $C \rightarrow A$ ) using all the dependencies in F

```
R1: C→E (F3)  
R2: E→A (F4)  
R3: C→A (R1, R2, A2 transitivity)
```

Successful derivation of dependency G3 ( $E \rightarrow AE$ ) using all the dependencies in F

```
R1: E→E (A1 triviality)  
R2: E→A (F4)  
R3: E→AE (R1, R2, A3 composition)
```

Successful derivation of dependency G4 ( $AB \rightarrow D$ ) using all the dependencies in F

```
R1: AB→A (A1 triviality)  
R2: A→C (F1)  
R3: AB→C (R1, R2, A2 transitivity)  
R4: AB→B (A1 triviality)  
R5: AB→BC (R3, R4, A3 composition)  
R6: BC→D (F2)  
R7: AB→D (R5, R6, A2 transitivity)
```

Analogously, we also need to verify that every single functional dependency in F can be successfully derived using the dependencies in G

Conclusion: yes, F is a cover of G, as well as G is a cover of F (this relation is symmetrical)

---

### 03: Redundant FDs

```
F = {  
  AC→B, // F1  
  E→B, // F2  
  D→C, // F3  
  AC→E, // F4  
  E→AC // F5  
}
```

Successful derivation of dependency F1 ( $AC \rightarrow B$ ) using all the remaining dependencies in the original F

```
R1: AC→E (F4)  
R2: E→B (F2)  
R3: AC→B (R1, R2, A2 transitivity)
```

Successful derivation of dependency F2 ( $E \rightarrow B$ ) using all the remaining dependencies in the original F

```
R1: E→AC (F5)  
R2: AC→B (F1)  
R3: E→B (R1, R2, A2 transitivity)
```

Conclusion: both the dependencies F1 and F2 are redundant when assessed individually, but after one of them is removed, the other will no longer be redundant as a result (F1 was needed for the derivation of F2 and vice versa)

---

## 04: Attribute Closures

```
F = {  
  AB→D, // F1  
  A→CE, // F2  
  F→F, // F3  
  C→A, // F4  
  E→AE // F5  
}
```

```
A+ = {  
  A, // A1 triviality  
  C, E // F2  
}
```

```
F+ = {  
  F // A1 triviality  
}
```

```
BC+ = {  
  B, C, // A1 triviality  
  A, // F4  
  D, // F1  
  E // F2  
}
```

```
ABF+ = {  
  A, B, F, // A1 triviality  
  D, // F1  
  C, E // F2  
}
```

Observation: ABF is a super-key (since its attribute closure contains all the attributes), but not necessarily a key

---

## 05: Cover of a Set of FDs

```
F = {
  A→BEF, // F1
  BC→DE, // F2
  BDE→F, // F3
  ADF→CE, // F4
  E→CBD // F5
}
G = {
  A→B, // G1
  AB→E, // G2
  AD→C, // G3
  BC→E, // G4
  BCE→FD, // G5
  E→C, // G6
  CE→B // G7
}
```

Successful derivation of dependency F1 ( $A \rightarrow BEF$ ) using all the dependencies in G

```
A+ = {
  A, // A1 triviality
  B, // G1
  E, // G2
  C, // G6
  F, D // G5
}  $\supseteq$  {B, E, F}
```

Analogously for all the remaining functional dependencies in F using G and vice versa

Conclusion: yes, F is a cover of G, as well as G is a cover of F

---

## 06: Redundant FDs

```
F = {  
  A→C, // F1  
  B→A, // F2  
  D→AB, // F3  
  B→C, // F4  
  D→C // F5  
}
```

F1 (A→C) is not redundant since A<sup>+</sup> using all the remaining FDs (all except F1) does not contain C

```
A+ using F2, F3, F4 and F5 = {  
  A // A1 triviality  
}
```

F2 (B→A) is not redundant since B<sup>+</sup> using all the remaining FDs (all except F2) does not contain A

```
B+ using F1, F3, F4 and F5 = {  
  B, // A1 triviality  
  C // F4  
}
```

F3 (D→AB) is not redundant since D<sup>+</sup> using all the remaining FDs (all except F3) does not contain both A and B

```
D+ using F1, F2, F4 and F5 = {  
  D, // A1 triviality  
  C // F5  
}
```

F4 (B→C) is redundant since B<sup>+</sup> using all the remaining FDs (all except F4) contains C, and so F4 can be removed

```
B+ using F1, F2, F3 and F5 = {  
  B, // A1 triviality  
  A, // F2  
  C // F1  
} ⊇ {C}
```

F5 (D→C) is also redundant since D<sup>+</sup> using all the remaining FDs (all except F5 and F4) contains C

```
D+ using F1, F2 and F3 = {  
  D, // A1 triviality  
  A, B, // F3  
  C // F1  
} ⊇ {C}
```

Conclusion: both F4 (B→C) and F5 (D→C) were redundant and could be removed

---

## 07: Redundant Attributes

```
F = {  
  AB→D, // F1  
  A→CE, // F2  
  C→A, // F3  
  E→AE, // F4  
  F→B, // F5  
  BCEF→A // F6  
}
```

Attribute A is not redundant in F1 ( $AB \rightarrow D$ ) since attribute closure of all the remaining attributes (i.e. just B) does not contain D, and so it cannot be removed

```
B+ = {  
  B // A1 triviality  
}
```

Attribute B is not redundant in F1 ( $AB \rightarrow D$ ), and so it cannot be removed as well

```
A+ = {  
  A, // A1 triviality  
  C, E // F2  
}
```

Conclusion: there are no redundant attributes in F1 ( $AB \rightarrow D$ )

Attribute B is redundant in F6 ( $BCEF \rightarrow A$ ), and so F6 can be replaced with F6' ( $CEF \rightarrow A$ )

```
CEF+ = {  
  C, E, F, // A1 triviality  
  A, // F3  
  B, // F5  
  D // F1  
}  $\supseteq$  {A}
```

Attribute C is redundant in F6' ( $CEF \rightarrow A$ ), and so F6' can be replaced with F6'' ( $EF \rightarrow A$ )

```
EF+ = {  
  E, F, // A1 triviality  
  A, // F4  
  C, // F2  
  B, // F5  
  D // F1  
}  $\supseteq$  {A}
```

Attribute E is not redundant in F6'' ( $EF \rightarrow A$ ), and so it cannot be removed

```
F+ = {  
  F, // A1 triviality  
  B // F5  
}
```

Attribute F is redundant in F6'' ( $EF \rightarrow A$ ), and so F6'' can be replaced with F6''' ( $E \rightarrow A$ )

```
E+ = {  
  E, // A1 triviality  
  A, // F4  
  C // F2  
}  $\supseteq$  {A}
```

Conclusion: attributes B, C and F were redundant in F6 ( $BCEF \rightarrow A$ ), and so F6 could be replaced with F6''' ( $E \rightarrow A$ )

---

### 08: Minimal Cover of a Set of FDs

Solution 1

$BC \rightarrow D$ ,  $BC \rightarrow E$ ,  $DE \rightarrow B$ ,  $CE \rightarrow A$ ,  $CE \rightarrow B$

Solution 2

$BC \rightarrow A$ ,  $BC \rightarrow D$ ,  $BC \rightarrow E$ ,  $DE \rightarrow B$ ,  $CE \rightarrow B$

---

### 09: Minimal Cover of a Set of FDs

$AB \rightarrow C$ ,  $C \rightarrow A$ ,  $BC \rightarrow D$ ,  $D \rightarrow E$ ,  $D \rightarrow G$ ,  $BE \rightarrow C$ ,  $CG \rightarrow B$ ,  $CE \rightarrow G$

---

### 10: Minimal Cover of a Set of FDs

Solution: there are no redundant attributes and nor redundant dependencies

$AB \rightarrow H$ ,  $EB \rightarrow C$ ,  $BC \rightarrow A$ ,  $C \rightarrow F$ ,  $F \rightarrow G$ ,  $A \rightarrow E$ ,  $A \rightarrow C$ ,  $E \rightarrow D$

---

## 11: First Key

We start with a trivial super-key ABCDE (i.e. a super-key containing all the attributes) and remove all redundant attributes from a trivial functional dependency  $ABCDE \rightarrow ABCDE$

Attribute A is not redundant in  $ABCDE \rightarrow ABCDE$

```
BCDE+ = {  
  B, C, D, E // A1 triviality  
}
```

Attribute B is redundant in  $ABCDE \rightarrow ABCDE$ , and so we obtain a simplified dependency  $ACDE \rightarrow ABCDE$

```
ACDE+ = {  
  A, C, D, E, // A1 triviality  
  B // F2 or F3  
}
```

Attribute C is not redundant in  $ACDE \rightarrow ABCDE$

```
ADE+ = {  
  A, D, E, // A1 triviality  
  B // F2  
}
```

Attribute D is redundant in  $ACDE \rightarrow ABCDE$ , and so we obtain a simplified dependency  $ACE \rightarrow ABCDE$

```
ACE+ = {  
  A, C, E, // A1 triviality  
  B, // F3  
  D // F1  
}
```

Attribute E is not redundant in  $ACE \rightarrow ABCDE$

```
AC+ = {  
  A, C // A1 triviality  
}
```

Conclusion: the first key is ACE

---

## 12: All Keys

Assumption: we already have one key, in particular the first key ACE (see above)

The initial working set of found keys is {ACE}

Step 1: processing of a key ACE (the first not yet processed key from the current working set of keys):

Dependency F1:  $BC \rightarrow DE$

Let us have a look at the intersection of the current key with the right side of this dependency

$$ACE \cap DE \neq \emptyset$$

Since this intersection is not empty, we will find a new key candidate

We take the current key, remove attributes from the right side and add attributes from the left side

$$(ACE \setminus DE) \cup BC = AC \cup BC = ABC$$

The current working set does not contain even a single key that would be a subset of this candidate

Therefore we continue and remove redundant attributes from ABC in order to obtain a new key

There are no such redundant attributes

Hence ABC is a newly found key, we add it into the current working set of keys

Dependency F2:  $DE \rightarrow B$

$ACE \cap B = \emptyset$  and thus this functional dependency cannot be used to find a new key

Dependency F3:  $CE \rightarrow B$

$$ACE \cap B = \emptyset$$

The current working set of found keys is {ACE, ABC}

Step 2: processing of a key ABC:

Dependency F1:  $BC \rightarrow DE$

$$ABC \cap DE = \emptyset$$

Dependency F2:  $DE \rightarrow B$

$$ABC \cap B \neq \emptyset$$

$$(ABC \setminus B) \cup DE = AC \cup DE = ACDE$$

$ACE \subseteq ACDE$  and therefore this candidate will not be further considered

Dependency F3:  $CE \rightarrow B$

$$ABC \cap B \neq \emptyset$$

$$(ABC \setminus B) \cup CE = AC \cup CE = ACE$$

$ACE \subseteq ACE$  and therefore this candidate will not be further considered as well

All keys from the working set were successfully processed

Conclusion: {ACE, ABC} are all keys

---

## 13: All Keys

ADF, ABF, ACF

---

## 14: Normal Forms

The provided relational schema is in 3NF

	1NF	2NF	3NF	BCNF	
<b>BC→D:</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	<b>BCNF</b>
<b>BC→E:</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	<b>BCNF</b>
<b>DE→B:</b>	yes	yes	yes	no	<b>3NF</b>
<b>CE→B:</b>	yes	yes	yes	yes	<b>BCNF</b>