

Relational Model and Algebra

Introduction to Databases

CompSci 316 Fall 2017




DUKE
COMPUTER SCIENCE

Announcements (Tue. Sep. 4)

- Registration: class size will stay at 140; as a courtesy to others, please add/drop ASAP
- Homework #1 to be posted today; due in 2 weeks
 - Sign up for Piazza & Gradiance
 - Set up VM (instructions on course website)
- TA/UTA office hours to be posted soon

Edgar F. Codd (1923-2003)



- Pilot in the Royal Air Force in WW2
- Inventor of the relational model and algebra while at IBM
- Turing Award, 1981

Relational data model

- A database is a collection of **relations** (or **tables**)
- Each relation has a set of **attributes** (or **columns**)
- Each attribute has a name and a **domain** (or **type**)
 - Set-valued attributes are not allowed
- Each relation contains a set of **tuples** (or **rows**)
 - Each tuple has a value for each attribute of the relation
 - Duplicate tuples are not allowed
 - Two tuples are duplicates if they agree on all attributes

👉 Simplicity is a virtue!

Example

User

| <i>uid</i> | <i>name</i> | <i>age</i> | <i>pop</i> |
|------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| 142 | Bart | 10 | 0.9 |
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 |
| 456 | Ralph | 8 | 0.3 |
| ... | ... | ... | ... |

Ordering of rows doesn't matter
(even though output is
always in some order)

Group

| <i>gid</i> | <i>name</i> |
|------------|----------------------|
| abc | Book Club |
| gov | Student Government |
| dps | Dead Putting Society |
| ... | ... |

Member

| <i>uid</i> | <i>gid</i> |
|------------|------------|
| 142 | dps |
| 123 | gov |
| 857 | abc |
| 857 | gov |
| 456 | abc |
| 456 | gov |
| ... | ... |

Schema vs. instance

- **Schema (metadata)**
 - Specifies the logical structure of data
 - Is defined at setup time
 - Rarely changes
 - **Instance**
 - Represents the data content
 - Changes rapidly, but always conforms to the schema
- 👉 Compare to **types** vs. collections of **objects of these types** in a programming language

Example

- Schema


- *User* (*uid* int, *name* string, *age* int, *pop* float)
- *Group* (*gid* string, *name* string)
- *Member* (*uid* int, *gid* string)

- Instance

- *User*: {⟨142, Bart, 10, 0.9⟩, ⟨857, Milhouse, 10, 0.2⟩, ... }
- *Group*: {⟨abc, Book Club⟩, ⟨gov, Student Government⟩, ... }
- *Member*: {⟨142, dps⟩, ⟨123, gov⟩, ... }

Relational algebra

A language for querying relational data based on “operators”



- **Core** operators:
 - Selection, projection, cross product, union, difference, and renaming
- Additional, **derived** operators:
 - Join, natural join, intersection, etc.
- Compose operators to make complex queries


Selection

- Input: a table R
- Notation: $\sigma_p R$
 - p is called a **selection condition** (or **predicate**)
- Purpose: filter rows according to some criteria
- Output: same columns as R , but only rows of R that satisfy p

Selection example

- Users with popularity higher than 0.5

$$\sigma_{pop>0.5} User$$



More on selection

- Selection condition can include any column of R , constants, comparison ($=$, \leq , etc.) and Boolean connectives (\wedge : and, \vee : or, \neg : not)
 - Example: users with popularity at least 0.9 and age under 10 or above 12

$$\sigma_{pop \geq 0.9 \wedge (age < 10 \vee age > 12)} User$$

- You must be able to evaluate the condition over **each single row** of the input table!
 - Example: the most popular user

$$\sigma_{pop \geq \text{every pop in } User} User$$

WRONG!


Projection

- Input: a table R
- Notation: $\pi_L R$
 - L is a list of columns in R
- Purpose: output chosen columns
- Output: same rows, but only the columns in L

Projection example

- IDs and names of all users


$\pi_{uid,name} User$



More on projection

- Duplicate output rows are removed (by definition)
 - Example: user ages

$\pi_{age} User$



Cross product


- Input: two tables R and S
- Notation: $R \times S$
- Purpose: pairs rows from two tables
- Output: for each row r in R and each s in S , output a row rs (concatenation of r and s)

Cross product example

User × *Member*

| <i>uid</i> | <i>name</i> | <i>age</i> | <i>pop</i> |
|------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 |
| ... | ... | ... | ... |

| <i>uid</i> | <i>gid</i> |
|------------|------------|
| 123 | gov |
| 857 | abc |
| 857 | gov |
| ... | ... |



| <i>uid</i> | <i>name</i> | <i>age</i> | <i>pop</i> | <i>uid</i> | <i>gid</i> |
|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 | 123 | gov |
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 | 857 | abc |
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 | 857 | gov |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | 123 | gov |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | 857 | abc |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | 857 | gov |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |

A note a column ordering

- Ordering of columns is unimportant as far as contents are concerned

| <i>uid</i> | <i>name</i> | <i>age</i> | <i>pop</i> | <i>uid</i> | <i>gid</i> |
|------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 | 123 | gov |
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 | 857 | abc |
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 | 857 | gov |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | 123 | gov |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | 857 | abc |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | 857 | gov |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |

=

| <i>uid</i> | <i>gid</i> | <i>uid</i> | <i>name</i> | <i>age</i> | <i>pop</i> |
|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| 123 | gov | 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 |
| 857 | abc | 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 |
| 857 | gov | 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 |
| 123 | gov | 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 |
| 857 | abc | 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 |
| 857 | gov | 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |

- So cross product is **commutative**, i.e., for any R and S , $R \times S = S \times R$ (up to the ordering of columns)

Derived operator: join

(A.k.a. “theta-join”)

- Input: two tables R and S
- Notation: $R \bowtie_p S$
 - p is called a **join condition** (or **predicate**)
- Purpose: relate rows from two tables according to some criteria
- Output: for each row r in R and each row s in S , output a row rs if r and s satisfy p
- Shorthand for $\sigma_p(R \times S)$

Join example

- Info about users, plus IDs of their groups

$User \bowtie_{User.uid=Member.uid} Member$

| uid | name | age | pop |
|-----|----------|-----|-----|
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 |
| ... | ... | ... | ... |

| uid | gid |
|-----|-----|
| 123 | gov |
| 857 | abc |
| 857 | gov |
| ... | ... |



Prefix a column reference with table name and “.” to disambiguate identically named columns from different tables

| uid | name | age | pop | uid | gid |
|-----|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 | 123 | gov |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | 857 | abc |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | 857 | gov |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |

Derived operator: natural join


- Input: two tables R and S
- Notation: $R \bowtie S$
- Purpose: relate rows from two tables, and
 - Enforce equality between identically named columns
 - Eliminate one copy of identically named columns
- Shorthand for $\pi_L(R \bowtie_p S)$, where
 - p equates each pair of columns common to R and S
 - L is the union of column names from R and S (with duplicate columns removed)

Natural join example

$$\begin{aligned}
 User \bowtie Member &= \pi_{?}(User \bowtie_{?} Member) \\
 &= \pi_{uid, name, age, pop, gid} \left(User \bowtie_{\substack{User.uid = \\ Member.uid}} Member \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

| uid | name | age | pop |
|-----|----------|-----|-----|
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 |
| ... | ... | ... | ... |

| uid | gid |
|-----|-----|
| 123 | gov |
| 857 | abc |
| 857 | gov |
| ... | ... |



| uid | name | age | pop | | gid |
|-----|----------|-----|-----|--|-----|
| 123 | Milhouse | 10 | 0.2 | | gov |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | | abc |
| 857 | Lisa | 8 | 0.7 | | gov |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | | ... |

Union

- Input: two tables R and S
- Notation: $R \cup S$
 - R and S must have identical schema
- Output:
 - Has the same schema as R and S
 - Contains all rows in R and all rows in S (with duplicate rows removed)

Difference

- Input: two tables R and S
- Notation: $R - S$
 - R and S must have identical schema
- Output:
 - Has the same schema as R and S
 - Contains all rows in R that are not in S

Derived operator: intersection

- Input: two tables R and S
- Notation: $R \cap S$
 - R and S must have identical schema
- Output:
 - Has the same schema as R and S
 - Contains all rows that are in both R and S
- Shorthand for?

Renaming

- Input: a table R and S
- Notation: $\rho_S R$, $\rho_{(A_1, A_2, \dots)} R$, or $\rho_{S(A_1, A_2, \dots)} R$
- Purpose: “rename” a table and/or its columns
- Output: a table with the same rows as R , but called differently
- Used to
 - Avoid confusion caused by identical column names
 - Create identical column names for natural joins
- As with all other relational operators, it doesn't modify the database
 - Think of the renamed table as a copy of the original

Renaming example

- IDs of users who belong to at least two groups


$Member \bowtie_? Member$

$\pi_{uid} \left(Member \bowtie_{\substack{Member.uid=Member.uid \wedge \\ Member.gid \neq Member.gid}} Member \right)$

WRONG!

$\pi_{uid_1} \left(\begin{array}{l} \rho_{(uid_1, gid_1)} Member \\ \bowtie_{uid_1=uid_2 \wedge gid_1 \neq gid_2} \\ \rho_{(uid_2, gid_2)} Member \end{array} \right)$

Expression tree notation



Summary of core operators

- Selection: $\sigma_p R$
- Projection: $\pi_L R$
- Cross product: $R \times S$
- Union: $R \cup S$
- Difference: $R - S$
- Renaming: $\rho_{S(A_1, A_2, \dots)} R$
 - Does not really add “processing” power

Summary of derived operators

- Join: $R \bowtie_p S$
- Natural join: $R \bowtie S$
- Intersection: $R \cap S$

- Many more
 - Semijoin, anti-semijoin, quotient, ...

An exercise

- Names of users in Lisa's groups

Writing a query bottom-up: Their names

Users in
Lisa's groups

Lisa's groups

Who's Lisa?

$\sigma_{name="Lisa"}$
|
User

Another exercise

- IDs of groups that Lisa doesn't belong to


Writing a query top-down:

A trickier exercise

- Who are the most popular?

*A deeper question:
When (and why) is “—” needed?*

Monotone operators



- If some old output rows may need to be removed
 - Then the operator is **non-monotone**
- Otherwise the operator is **monotone**
 - That is, old output rows always remain “correct” when more rows are added to the input
- Formally, for a monotone operator op :
 $R \subseteq R'$ implies $op(R) \subseteq op(R')$ for any R, R'

Classification of relational operators

- Selection: $\sigma_p R$
- Projection: $\pi_L R$
- Cross product: $R \times S$
- Join: $R \bowtie_p S$
- Natural join: $R \bowtie S$
- Union: $R \cup S$
- Difference: $R - S$
- Intersection: $R \cap S$

Why is “–” needed for “highest”?

- Composition of monotone operators produces a **monotone query**
 - Old output rows remain “correct” when more rows are added to the input
- Is the “highest” query monotone?

Why do we need core operator X ?

- Difference
 - The only non-monotone operator
- Projection
 - The only operator that removes columns
- Cross product
 - The only operator that adds columns
- Union
 - The only operator that allows you to add rows?
 - A more rigorous argument?
- Selection?
 - Homework problem

Extensions to relational algebra

- Duplicate handling (“bag algebra”)
 - Grouping and aggregation
 - “Extension” (or “extended projection”) to allow new column values to be computed
- ☞ All these will come up when we talk about SQL
- ☞ But for now we will stick to standard relational algebra without these extensions

Why is r.a. a good query language?

- Simple
 - A small set of core operators
 - Semantics are easy to grasp
- Declarative?
 - Yes, compared with older languages like CODASYL
 - Though operators do look somewhat “procedural”
- Complete?
 - With respect to what?

Relational calculus

- $\{u.uid \mid u \in User \wedge \neg(\exists u' \in User: u.pop < u'.pop)\}$, or
- $\{u.uid \mid u \in User \wedge (\forall u' \in User: u.pop \geq u'.pop)\}$
- Relational algebra = “safe” relational calculus
 - Every query expressible as a safe relational calculus query is also expressible as a relational algebra query
 - And vice versa
- Example of an “unsafe” relational calculus query
 - $\{u.name \mid \neg(u \in User)\}$
 - Cannot evaluate it just by looking at the database

Turing machine

- A conceptual device that can execute any computer algorithm
- Approximates what **general-purpose programming languages** can do
 - E.g., Python, Java, C++, ...



Alan Turing (1912-1954)

☞ So how does relational algebra compare with a Turing machine?

Limits of relational algebra

- Relational algebra has **no recursion**
 - Example: given relation *Friend*(*uid1*, *uid2*), who can Bart reach in his social network with any number of hops?
 - Writing this query in r.a. is impossible!
 - So r.a. is not as powerful as general-purpose languages
- But why not?
 - Optimization becomes **undecidable**
 - ☞ Simplicity is empowering
 - Besides, you can always implement it at the application level, and recursion is added to SQL nevertheless!