

AD-A077 092


WISCONSIN UNIV-MADISON MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER
CALCULATING CONSTRAINTS ON RELATIONAL EXPRESSIONS. (U)
MAY 79 A KLUG
MRC-TSR-1961

F/G 12/1

DAAG29-75-C-0024
NL

UNCLASSIFIED

| OF |
AD-
A077092



END
DATE
FILMED
12-79
DDC

~~SECRET~~
~~SECRET~~

AD A 077092

MRC Technical Summary Report #1961

CALCULATING CONSTRAINTS ON
RELATIONAL EXPRESSIONS

A. Klug

Mathematics Research Center
University of Wisconsin-Madison
610 Walnut Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

DDC
NOV 26 1979
E

See 143

May 1979

Received May 1, 1979

DDC FILE COPY

Approved for public release
Distribution unlimited

Sponsored by

U. S. Army Research Office
P.O. Box 12211
Research Triangle Park
North Carolina 27709

National Research Council of Canada
Montreal Road
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R6
Canada

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON
MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER

CALCULATING CONSTRAINTS ON RELATIONAL EXPRESSIONS

A. Klug

Technical Summary Report #1961
May 1979

ABSTRACT

↙
A desirable feature of a database management system is the ability to support many views of the database via several user models. In order to provide this support while allowing the user to believe that his/her view and data model are the only ones, the database system must have a number of facilities. One of the most important of these is a mechanism to tell when view constraints will be satisfied given that the underlying database constraints are satisfied so that the user always sees what is expected.

This paper deals with a particular instance of this problem where the constraints are functional dependencies and the views are created through relational algebra expressions. The problem immediately reduces to the problem of calculating all valid functional dependencies (and other constraints) on a relational algebra expression over relations in the base schema. The problem is undecidable in general but we give a sound and complete algorithm when set difference is omitted from relational algebra.

AMS (MOS) Subject Classification: 68-02

Key Words: multiple views, relational algebra
functional dependencies, completeness

Work Unit No: 8 - Computer Science

p. -A-

Sponsored by the United States Army under Contract No. DAAG29-75-C-0024.
This work is based upon work supported by the Computer Science Department,
University of Wisconsin-Madison and the National Research Council of Canada.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Definitions	5
3. The Algorithm	8
4. Soundness of the Algorithm	28
5. Completeness of the Algorithm	32
6. Summary and Conclusions	44
7. References	47
8. Appendix: Proofs of Selected Theorems	49

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or special
A	

A. Klug

1. Introduction

Database management systems exist to (among other things) give users facilities suited to their needs, privileges and levels of expertise. One tool for providing these facilities is the view (e.g., [ChGT]). A view can mask off parts of the database; it can rearrange the database's structure, and it can accept a customized set of operations. In general, a view can tailor the database to the needs and privileges of a user.

Ideally, users of a view should not have to be aware of the fact that they are interacting with a view of the database rather than with a "ground level" database. Now schemas generally contain various constraints in addition to object descriptions. That is, the schema not only tells the user what objects are available and in what relationships, but also what restrictions on the form and structures of the objects hold. This means that, if the user need not be aware of the level of indirection introduced by the view, there must be some built-in database mechanism which can ensure that these view constraints are always satisfied. An example will help clarify what we mean:

Suppose the underlying (or conceptual level[ANSI]) database is described by the relational schema:

Car-Part(CP#,Color,Wt)

Boat-Part(BP#,Color,Wt).

Here, CP# and BP# are keys of their respective relations.

Sponsored by the United States Army under Contract No. DAAG29-75-C-0024. This work is based upon work supported by the Computer Science Department, University of Wisconsin-Madison and the National Research Council of Canada.

Suppose also that some user wants to have a view according to the schema

Part (P#, Wt).

(We will specify below how this view is to be derived from the base relations.) The constraints in these schemas are that CP#, BP# and P# are keys in their respective relations.

Suppose the Part view was derived by the Sequel[ABCE] statement:

```
select CP#,Wt from Car-Part where color='red'.
```

Then the key constraint in the user view would always be satisfied since the view is just a subset of Car-Part.

Instead, suppose the Part view were equivalent to the retrieval:

```
(select CP#,Wt from Car-Part)
union
(select BP#,Wt from Boat-Part)
```

Here, the user may fail to be presented with a view in which P# is a key of the Part relation. This is because we might have a Car-Part with the same number as a Boat-Part, but the two weights may be different.

What is needed is a mechanism which can tell that the first view is acceptable while the second is not. More generally, a mechanism is needed which, given any underlying schema, any view schema, and any mapping between the two, can decide whether or not the constraints in the view schema will always be satisfied

(assuming the underlying constraints are always satisfied). In terms of the framework proposed by the ANSI/X3/SPARC database study group[ANSI], we are recognizing the need for a processing function which can accept or reject mappings between a conceptual schema and an external schema. Note that correct rejection is just as important as correct acceptance. Correct acceptance means that the processor would not accept any mappings which would cause view constraint violations; correct rejection means that the processing function would not reject any mapping which would never cause any constraint violation. Recognizing this type of correctness of mappings is an important problem and one which we study in this paper. More details on this subject may be found in [Klug].

The key constraints we used in the above example are closely related to functional dependencies. Functional dependency constraints, which state that certain attributes are in functional relationships with other attributes, are important and ubiquitous in data modelling. Any algorithms for the problem we are discussing must at least be applicable to schemas containing functional dependency constraints.

In the example, the mapping of the view to the base schema was made via the Sequel language. For purposes of the presentation, we will have all mappings expressed as relational algebra expressions[Codd]. Then calculating whether or not some functional dependency on a relation in a view is valid is the same as calculating whether or not this functional dependency is valid on the relational algebra expression corresponding to the view relation. Hence, the problem we consider in this paper is

the following:

Given a schema s containing relations and functional dependencies and an arbitrary relational algebra expression e over relations in s , determine exactly the set of valid functional dependencies on e .

In the next section, we will give the basic definitions to be used throughout the paper. Section 3 will formulate the algorithm, and Section 4 will show it is sound. Then in Section 5 we accomplish the more difficult task of showing that the algorithm is complete. Finally, in Section 6 we draw some conclusions.

2. Definitions

In this section we will present the basic concepts of schema, relational algebra expression, structure, state and validity.

A relation declaration has the form 'name(degree)'; for example, $R(10)$ defines a relation R of degree 10.

A relational algebra expression consists of relation names and the operators: projection ' $[\cdot]$ ', restriction ' $[\cdot=.]$ ', selection ' $[\cdot\equiv.]$ ', cross product ' \times ', union ' \cup ' and difference ' $-$ '. The syntax is defined by the following BNFs:

- [I] $e ::= \text{name} \mid e[X] \mid e[X=Y] \mid e[X\equiv V] \mid$
 $e \times e \mid e \cup e \mid e - e$
- [II] $e ::= \text{name} \mid e[X] \mid e[X=Y] \mid e[X\equiv V] \mid$
 $e \times e \mid e \cup e$

- [III] $e ::= e_1$
- $e_1 ::= e_2 \mid e_1 \cup e_1 \mid e_1[X]$
- $e_2 ::= e_3 \mid e_2[X=Y]$
- $e_3 ::= e_4 \mid e_3 \times e_3$
- $e_4 ::= \text{name} \mid e_4[X \equiv V]$
- [IV] $e ::= e_1$
- $e_1 ::= e_2 \mid e_1 \cup e_1 \mid e_1[X]$
- $e_2 ::= e_3 \mid e_2 \times e_2$
- $e_3 ::= \text{name} \mid e_3[X \equiv V]$

We will see later why we have four variants of relational algebra. Unless otherwise stated, the general form [I] is understood.

The join operator is a derived operator in this framework and is defined as follows:

$$R[X=Y]S \text{ is } (R \times S)[X=Y'], \text{ where } Y' = Y + \text{deg}(R).$$

Intersection can also be defined from the given operators.

A functional dependency statement (FD) has the form 'expr:d*->d', where expr is a relational algebra expression, d* is a set of zero or more domain numbers, and d is a domain number. (We number relation domains rather than name them in order to facilitate joining relations with themselves.)

A schema consists of a set of relation declarations and functional dependency statements on the relations named in the schema.

A structure str for a schema s consists of a universe U of data elements, for each constant symbol i an interpretation $c_i \in$

U , and for each relation $R(n)$ in the schema s , a set $R(\text{str})$ of n -tuples over U . (The constant symbol interpretations allow arbitrary data universes to be properly modelled.)

The value $e(\text{str})$ of a relational algebra expression e in a structure str is defined by interpreting the relational algebra operators in the usual manner:

- [1] $R(\text{str})$ is "itself"
- [2] $e[X](\text{str}) = \{t[X] : t \in e(\text{str})\}$
- [3] $e[X=Y](\text{str}) = \{t : t[X]=t[Y] \ \& \ t \in e(\text{str})\}$
- [4] $e[X \equiv V](\text{str}) = \{t : t[X]=V \ \& \ t \in e(\text{str})\}$
- [5] $(e_1 \times e_2)(\text{str}) = \{t_1 \times t_2 : t_1 \in e_1(\text{str}) \ \& \ t_2 \in e_2(\text{str})\}$,
where $t_1 \times t_2$ denotes the concatenation of t_1 and t_2
- [6] $(e_1 \cup e_2)(\text{str}) = \{t : t \in e_1(\text{str}) \ \text{or} \ t \in e_2(\text{str})\}$
- [7] $(e_1 - e_2)(\text{str}) = \{t : t \in e_1(\text{str}) \ \& \ t \notin e_2(\text{str})\}$

A functional dependency $e:Z \rightarrow A$ is true in a structure str if for every pair t_1, t_2 of tuples in $e(\text{str})$, if $t_1[Z]=t_2[Z]$, then $t_1[A]=t_2[A]$.

A structure str is a state with respect to a schema s if every functional dependency in s is true in str .

A functional dependency $e:Z \rightarrow A$ is valid with respect to a schema s if $e:Z \rightarrow A$ is true in every state of s .

We can now state our problem precisely:

Given a schema s and a relational algebra expression e over s , determine the valid FDs on e .

3. The Algorithm

This section will present rules for determining the valid constraints on a relational algebra expression. We limit our study to functional dependencies because FDs are important, familiar and well-understood. However, because the relations we look at are actually expressions involving restrictions and selections, it will be necessary to define two additional types of constraints which will reflect the structure introduced by these operators. We will call these constraints equality constraints (EQs).

Consider the following example:

s: R(2), S(2)

R:1→2, S:1→2

e: R[2=1]S

In e the FDs 1→2 and 3→4 are valid. Because domains 2 and 3, which are the joined domains, are always equal in e, we can follow the FD 1→2 and then 3→4 to get a valid FD 1→4 in e. In order to be able to formally derive this FD, we need domain equalities (DEQs) as a constraint type:

A domain equality has the form $e:X=Y$. It is true in a structure str if $t[X]=t[Y]$ for each $t \in e(\text{str})$. A DEQ $e:X=Y$ is valid with respect to a schema s if it is true in every state of s.

Next consider the example:

$s: R(3), R:1,2 \rightarrow 3$

$e: R[2 \equiv '8']$

In this example, states for the expression e will always have a value '8' in domain 2. Thus, given a value for domain 1, the value of domain 2 is determined, and therefore domain 3 is determined by the FD. Hence, the FD $1 \rightarrow 3$ is valid in e . In order to be able to formally derive this FD, we need value equalities (VEQs) as a constraint type:

A value equality has the form $e: X \equiv V$. It is true in a structure str if $t[X] = V$ for every $t \in e(str)$. A VEQ $e: X \equiv V$ is valid with respect to a schema s if it is true in every state of s .

We now proceed to derive inference rules for these constraints. The natural way to develop these rules is in two steps. First, we will need rules describing the derivation of new constraints from old ones on the same expression. For example, regardless of what the expression is, we can derive $1 \rightarrow 3$ from $1 \rightarrow 2$ and $2 \rightarrow 3$. The second group of rules will tell how to derive constraints on an expression from the derivable constraints on its subexpressions. For example, from $R: 2 \rightarrow 3$ we can derive $1 \rightarrow 2$ on the projection $R[2,3]$.

We will first discuss constraints on single expressions.

When only FDs are considered, complete sets of rules already exist (e.g. [Arms]). The following three rules are one such set:

[A1] $\vdash X \rightarrow X$ (reflexivity)

[A2] $X \rightarrow Z \vdash X \cup Y \rightarrow Z$ (augmentation)

[A3] $X \rightarrow Y, Y \cup Z \rightarrow W \vdash X \cup Z \rightarrow W$ (pseudotransitivity)

(where ' \vdash ' means "derives")

See [Bern] for examples.

Now suppose that EQs are also involved.

The set of rules must include ones reflecting the basic properties of equality: Everything equals itself; hence, $X=X$ will always be derivable. The constraint $X=Y$ implies the constraint $Y=X$. Also $X=Y$ and $Y=Z$ imply $X=Z$.

VEQs also interact with DEQs: If $X=Y$ and $Y\equiv V$ are constraints, then the X -domains are constant and also equal V , i.e., $X\equiv V$ is a valid constraint. If $X\equiv V$ and $Y\equiv V$ are derivable, then so is $X=Y$.

EQs also interact with FDs. If $X=Y$ holds and X appears on the left- or right-hand-side of an FD, then the FD with X replaced by Y should also hold. If $X\equiv V$ holds and X appears on the left-hand-side of an FD, then since the X -domain is constant, we can drop X from the FD.

From this discussion we see that the following rules are valid:

- [i] $Z \rightarrow A, X=Y \vdash (Z-X) \cup Y \rightarrow A$
- [ii] $Z \rightarrow A, A=B \vdash Z \rightarrow B$
- [iii] $Z \rightarrow A, X\equiv V \vdash (Z-X) \rightarrow A$

Instead, we will use the following two rules which are equivalent to [i] - [iii]:

- [a] $X=Y \vdash X \rightarrow Y$
- [b] $X\equiv V \vdash \emptyset \rightarrow X$

With these two rules, we can drop the reflexive rule [A2] above, and we can also derive rules [i], [ii] and [iii] using transitivity.

There is another kind of interaction which is more difficult to detect. It is a problem which could not occur if we only considered constraints on a single relation, and it is to this problem that much of this paper is devoted. To illustrate, consider the following simple example:

s: $R(2), R:1 \rightarrow 2$

e: $R[1=1]R$

For this expression, the derivable constraints will include the FDs $1 \rightarrow 2$ and $3 \rightarrow 4$, and also the EQ $1=3$. But the two FDs are really the "same" since they arise from the same FD on the same base relation. Because their domains are equated by the EQ, their ranges must also be equal, i.e., the EQ $2=4$ must also hold.

In more general terms, whenever one or more relations appear as components on both sides of a join, some of the FDs on the join might actually be the "same".

The following is a slightly more complicated example:

s: $R(3), S(3), T(3)$

$R:1 \rightarrow 2$

e: $(R \bowtie S)[1,2][1=4](S[2=1]R)$

In the expression e, the (same) FD on R appears as $1 \rightarrow 2$ and as $1 \rightarrow 7$. A similar effect occurs with unions which will be illustrated shortly.

To tell when two FDs have the same origins, they need to be given labels or identifiers, so that when two labels are equal

(or "essentially" equal - as explained below), the two FDs are one and the same. Note that the "origins" of an FD in a relational expression will be tree-like. The tree structure is not only due to the axioms for FDs, especially pseudotransitivity, but also to the tree-structure of the relational expressions themselves. The FD identifiers are essentially derivation trees.

The next examples will informally describe what FD identifiers look like.

```
s: R(4), S(2)
   R:1->2, R:2,3->4
   S:1->2
e: R[4=1]S
```

The FD $1,3 \rightarrow 4$ will be derivable in e by rules we will present shortly. To see what the label of this FD is, we will make an informal derivation:


In the join $R[4=1]S$, the domain names of S have been shifted by four units (the length of R). So the FD $S:1 \rightarrow 2$ in the join can be represented as:

$$6-2-S-1-5,$$


where the arcs $6-$ and -5 represent the relabelling. (In this and in the following examples, the roots of trees will be either at the left or at the top.) The EQ constraint $4=5$ (which gives an FD $4 \rightarrow 5$) is valid in the join $R[4=1]S$ because of the join-condition, and so we may add the arc $5--4$ to the above FD label, obtaining:

6-2-S-1-5-4


as a label for the FD $4 \rightarrow 6$ which is valid in the join. The FD $R:2,3 \rightarrow 4$ is not renamed, so its label in the join is the tree:



The FD $R:1 \rightarrow 2$ combines with $R:2,3 \rightarrow 4$ by transitivity yielding $1,3 \rightarrow 4$, whose label is



We again apply transitivity to derive in the join the FD $1,3 \rightarrow 6$. Thus the FD in the first example can be represented by the following tree:




When selections occur, there are special nodes which appear in FD labels. For example:

s: $R(3)$, $R:1,2 \rightarrow 3$

e: $R[2 \neq '8']$


As we have mentioned before, the FD $1 \rightarrow 3$ is valid in this expression. Its label should be the following:



The next example illustrates the case when the label may have more than one leaf with the same domain name:

s: R(4), S(2)
 R:1,2,3->4
 S:1->2
 e: (R[1=2])[1=2]S

In e, we will have the FD 1,3->4 which results from the FD R:1,2,3->4 and the restriction on R in e. Its label is the following:



The EQ from the join-condition, 1=6, will combine with the FD S:1->2, which in the join is 5->6, to give the FD 5->1 with the label:

1-6-2-S-1-5.

Composing the FDs 1,3->4 and 5->1 in e to produce 3,5->4, will correspond to merging the previous two trees at the '1' nodes. Since there are two terminal '1' nodes in the tree for 1,3->4, two copies of the tree for 5->1 must be joined:

tive labels:

2—R—1 and 6—4—2—R—1—3—5—3—1.

The two FDs are the same, although their identifiers are not. However, the identifiers differ only in the "renaming" of the nodes. This example generalizes to the rule that if any two FDs have labels which differ only in "renaming segments", then they are the same FD.


There are two other ways in which FD identifiers may differ while still describing the same functional dependency. We will give two examples to illustrate:

s: R(4), R:1,3->4, R:1->2, R:3->2

S(3), S:1,2->3

e: R[2,4=2,1]S

In e there is the FD 1,3->7 which can be represented by either of the trees:




If e occurred twice within a larger relation, we might have derived the FD in the two occurrences with the two different identifiers. We would have to know that these identifiers represent the same FD. (These identifiers represent the same FD because the part $R:1 \rightarrow 2$ will determine the same R -tuple as $R:3 \rightarrow 2$ due to the presence of the FD $R:1,3 \rightarrow 4$.)

The second example is:

$s: R(4), R:1,2 \rightarrow 3, R:1,4 \rightarrow 2, R:1,4 \rightarrow 3$

$e: (R[2=2]R)[1,5 \equiv '0,0']$

In e , the FDs $4 \rightarrow 7$ and $4 \rightarrow 3$ can be associated, respectively, with the trees:



We must be able to "collapse" the identifier on the left and recognize it as equalling the one on the right. (Composing FDs across joins of the same relation is the same as composing FDs within a single relation.)

Finally, we note that a single FD may need to have several identifiers associated with it. If an expression e is a union $e_1 \cup e_2$, and an FD $Z \rightarrow A$ is valid in e , then we will need to associate one or more identifiers for $Z \rightarrow A$ from e_1 and one or more from e_2 . A more detailed example will be given in Section 4.

When the FD $e:Z \rightarrow A$ has the identifier id associated with it, we will write the association as $e:id:Z \rightarrow A$ or just $id:Z \rightarrow A$ and call this a labelled FD. When $Z \rightarrow A$ has several identifiers associated with it², we will write $\{id_i:i \in S\}:Z \rightarrow A$ or just $\{id_i\}:Z \rightarrow A$.

The first part of the algorithm for calculating constraints on expressions consists of a procedure for generating a "free structure"³. With respect to two FD identifiers, the free structure will show the equivalence or non-equivalence of the identifiers.

First we define a function "gentab" which generates (as side-effects) tables of tuples with formal values. Then a function "inervals" equates values according to the FDs present. If the appropriate domains of the two tuples corresponding to the roots of the two identifiers id_1, id_2 are equated then the value of the predicate $Eqv(id_1, id_2)$ is true, otherwise it is false.

² The need for several identifiers will be explained shortly.

³ This concept is similar to the notion of Henkin interpretation[Henk].

```

function Eqv(id1, id2 : FD-ident) : boolean;
begin
  fstr := empty; /* start with empty state */
  gentab(id1);
  gentab(id2);
  infervals;
  if id1(fstr;V) = id2(fstr;V)
    then Eqv := true
    else Eqv := false
end;

function gentab(id : FD-ident) : formal-value;
begin
  if id is a domain leaf 'n' then gentab := 'vn /*n-th formal value*/
  else if id is a value leaf 'v' then gentab := v
  else if succ(id) is a domain node then gentab := gentab(succ(id))
  else /* succ(id) is a relation name R; root(id) is a domain A, and
        the children of node R are id1, ..., idn whose roots are
        labelled Z1, ..., Zn */
    begin
      add new tuple t to R(fstr);
      for i:=1 to n do t[Zi] := gentab(idi);
      for Y not in {Z1, ..., Zn} do t[Y] := new_formal_value;
      gentab := t[A]
    end
end;
end;

```

```

procedure infervals;
begin
  changes := true;
  while(changes) do
    begin
      changes := false;
      for each R in schema do
        for each  $t_1, t_2$  in  $R(\text{fstr})$  do
          if FD  $R:Z \rightarrow A$  and  $t_1[Z]=t_2[Z]$  and  $t_1[A] \neq t_2[A]$ 
            then begin changes := true; equataval( $t_1[A], t_2[A]$ ) end
        end
      end;
end;

procedure equataval(x,y : formal-value);
begin
  for each R in schema do
    for each t in  $R(\text{fstr})$  do
      for each domain Z do if  $t[Z]=x$  then  $t[Z] := y$ 
    end.
end.

```

The predicate Eqv constitutes one part of our algorithm for determining valid constraints on relational algebra expressions. The next definition specifies the inference rules which we have already informally discussed for deriving constraints on a single expression. This constitutes the second part of the algorithm:

Let s be a schema; let e be an expression over s . The rules for deriving new EQs and labelled FDs from old ones on e are as follows⁴:

- [1] $X=Y \vdash Y=X$
- [2] $X=Y, Y=Z \vdash X=Z$
- [3] $X=Y, Y \equiv V \vdash X \equiv V$
- [4] $X \equiv V, Y \equiv V \vdash X=Y$
- [5] $\vdash X=X$
- [6] $X=Y \vdash \text{id}:X \rightarrow Y,$
where id is $X \rightarrow Y$
- [7] $X \equiv V \vdash \emptyset \rightarrow X$
where id is $'V' \rightarrow X$
- [8] $\{\text{id}_{1i}\}:Z \rightarrow A_1, \{\text{id}_{2j}\}:Z \rightarrow A_2, \forall i, j \text{ Eqv}(\text{id}_{1i}) = \text{Eqv}(\text{id}_{2j}) \vdash$
 $A_1 = A_2$
- [9] $\{\text{id}_{1i}\}:Z \rightarrow A, \{\text{id}_{2j}\}:A \cup X \rightarrow B \vdash \{\text{id}_{3ij}\}:Z \cup X \rightarrow B,$
where id_{3ij} is obtained from id_{2j} by merging a copy of id_{1i}
to every leaf of id_{2j} labelled A.

Any expression will always have just a finite number of derivable constraints. (There are only a finite number of EQs and FDs on an expression altogether.) The process of generating all derivable constraints with these rules from a given set of constraints will be called taking the closure and will be denoted 'Cl'.

Two additional conditions are used in the closure construction:

- [a] If an FD is already present, it will not be added with another identifier. This will prevent non-termination from

⁴ For technical reasons which will become apparent shortly, we have not explicitly included the augmentation rule. However, our notion of completeness will be appropriately modified, and there will be no loss of generality.

repeated application of rules [9] with FDs from rule [8].

[b] Any FDs $Z \rightarrow A$ such that an FD $Z_1 \rightarrow A$ is present with $Z_1 \subset Z$, $Z_1 \neq Z$, are removed.

We have specified inference rules for constraints on one expression from given constraints. Now we want to give rules for generating constraints on expressions from constraints derived on subexpressions. First we will informally discuss how this should be done, and then we will present the formal rules:

For a base relation R , we take the FDs in the schema belonging to R and label them by themselves. Then the closure operator is applied.

For projections, there are two special points. First, in order for an FD or an EQ to "survive" a projection, all of the referenced domains must be included in the projection. Second, we must rename the domains by the order of their appearance in the projection list. Take the following example:

s: $R(10), R:2,4,5 \rightarrow 8$
 $e_1: R[2,4,5,8]$
 $e_2: R[1,2,3,4,5,8]$
 $e_3: R[8,7,5,2,4]$
 $e_4: R[2,5,7,8]$

In the projection e_1 , the FD appears as $1,2,3 \rightarrow 4$. In e_2 , the FD is $2,4,5 \rightarrow 5$. In e_3 , it is $2,4,5 \rightarrow 1$, and in e_4 , there is no FD. If C is the set of derivable constraints for some expression e , then to get the set of derivable constraints for a projection $e[X]$, we need to find all the constraints in C which survive the

projection, but we do not need to apply the closure operator. The reason is that C is already closed, and if one or more constraints in C survive the projection and also combine according to one of the rules [1]-[9] defining closure, then the resulting constraint will also survive projection because every domain in the result appears in at least one of the original constraints. Notationally, the condition for $Z \rightarrow A$ to be derivable on $e[X]$ is that $X[Z] \rightarrow X[A]$ be derivable on e . The notation $X[Z]$ is like array subscripting: An attribute A is in $X[Z]$ if and only if there is some $j \in Z$ such that A is in the j -th position of X . For example, if X is 2,8,4,6 and Z is {2,4}, then $X[Z]$ is the set {6,8}.

In cross products, renaming also occurs. Given relations $R(m)$ and $S(n)$, the domains of S in the cross product $R \times S$ have been "shifted" by the length m of R . That is, they number $m+1$ through $m+n$. All constraints of S are valid in the cross product, but they have also been renamed accordingly.

For a restriction $e[X=Y]$, we add the constraint $X=Y$ to the ones already holding in e and take the closure. For a selection $e[X \equiv V]$, we similarly add $X \equiv V$ to the constraints of e and take the closure.

For a union $e_1 \cup e_2$, a constraint basically must hold in both components in order to hold in $e_1 \cup e_2$; any constraint valid on only one component can be violated by tuples in the other component, and these tuples will appear in the union. To get the EQs valid in $e_1 \cup e_2$, we simply take the intersection of the sets of valid EQs for e_1 and e_2 . To calculate the valid FDs, the FD identifiers must be considered; i.e., "intersection" must make

sure that the FD identifiers are Eqv. The next example will illustrate this:

s: R(2), S(2)

R:1- \rightarrow 2, S:1- \rightarrow 2

e_1 : R \cup S

e_2 : R[2 \equiv '2'] \cup R[2 \equiv '5']

In e_1 , the FD 1- \rightarrow 2 does not hold. For example, in the state st, where R(st) = {(0,0)} and S(st) = {(0,1)}, the FDs on the base relations are true, but (R \cup S)(st) = {(0,0),(0,1)}, and this violates the FD 1- \rightarrow 2.

Now consider the expression e_2 . Clearly the FD 1- \rightarrow 2 will be valid in this expression (since, e.g., R[2 \equiv '2'] \cup R[2 \equiv '5'] \subseteq R). This is because 1- \rightarrow 2 is the "same" FD in each component. In general, for an FD id:Z- \rightarrow A to appear in $e_1 \cup e_2$, it must be valid in both e_1 and e_2 and have the "same" identifier in both components.

If the two FDs are Eqv, then the FD is in the union. We must, however, attach both identifiers to the FD. The following example will illustrate why.

s: R(7) R:1,2→4 R:2,3→5 R:1,2→6 R:1,3→6 R:2,3→6
R:4,5,6→7

e₁: (((R[4=4]R)[5=5]R)[6=6]R)[7+1=21+1,7+2=14+2,14+3=21+3]
[7+1,7+2,1+3,0+7]

e₂: ((R[4=4]R)[5=5]R)[6=6]R)[7+2=14+2,7+2=21+2,14+3=21+3]
[7+1,7+2,14+3,0+7]

e₃: R{1,2,3,7}


e₄: e₁ ∪ e₃

e₅: e₂ ∪ e₃

e₆: e₁ ∪ e₂

e₇: e₄ ∪ e₂ = (e₁ ∪ e₃) ∪ e₂

In e₁ and e₂ we have written each domain in the restrictions as a displacement plus a domain of R, e.g., 14+2 denotes the second domain of the third copy of R in the join. In each of e₁, e₂ and e₃ the FD 1,2,3→4 is derivable and will have the following respective identifiers (with relabelling nodes removed):



And we have $\text{Eqv}(id_1, id_2)$, $\text{Eqv}(id_2, id_3)$ but not $\text{Eqv}(id_1, id_3)$.

However, on e₇ this FD is not valid. If we had only retained id₃ for the FD in e₄, then we would have incorrectly derived the FD on e₇. We could conceivably have a procedure to decide which identifier should be retained, but it is simpler just to keep them all.

The constraints derivable on a set difference will be the constraints derivable on the first component. There will be at least that many derivable constraints because the difference is a subset of the first component. More will be said about set difference later.

This discussion is formalized by the following definition:

Let s be a schema and e an expression over s . The set $\text{Drv}(e)$ of derivable constraints on e is defined by the following rules which use induction on the number of operations in e and in which "Cl" denotes the closure operator:

- [1] $\text{Drv}(R)$ — Take the closure of R 's FDs in the schema and have each FD $R:Z \rightarrow A$ labelled by the tree consisting of a root segment $R \rightarrow A$ (A is the root) and an arc $d \rightarrow$ into node R for each $d \in Z$.
- [2] $\text{Drv}(e[X])$ — Take all DEQs $Y=Z$ where $X[Y]=X[Z]$ is in $\text{Drv}(e)$, all VEQs $Y \equiv V$ where $X[Y] \equiv V$ is in $\text{Drv}(e)$, and all FDs $\text{id}_2:Z \rightarrow A$ such that $\text{id}_1:X[Z] \rightarrow X[A]$ is in $\text{Drv}(e)$, where id_2 is obtained from id_1 by attaching to each leaf $X[d]$ of id_1 the arc $d \rightarrow$, and to the root $X[A]$ of id_1 the arc $\rightarrow A$.
- [3] $\text{Drv}(e[X=Y])$ — Add $X=Y$ to $\text{Drv}(e)$ and take the closure.
- [4] $\text{Drv}(e[X \equiv V])$ — Add $X \equiv V$ to $\text{Drv}(e)$ and take the closure.
- [5] $\text{Drv}(e_1 \times e_2)$ — Rename the constraints in $\text{Drv}(e_2)$ according to the degree of e_1 , i.e., a DEQ $X=Y$ becomes $X+k=Y+k$ ($k=\text{degree}(e_1)$); a VEQ becomes $X+k \equiv V$, and an FD $\text{id}_1:Z \rightarrow A$ becomes $\text{id}_2:Z+k \rightarrow A+k$, where id_2 is obtained from id_1 by

adding an arc $d+k$ to each leaf labelled d , and an arc $-A+k$ to the root. Then add $\text{Drv}(e_2)$ renamed to $\text{Drv}(e_1)$ and take the closure.

[6] $\text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)$ — An EQ $X=Y$ or $X \equiv V$ is in $\text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)$ if it is in both $\text{Drv}(e_1)$ and $\text{Drv}(e_2)$. If $\{id_{1i}\}:Z \rightarrow A$ is in $\text{Drv}(e_1)$ and $\{id_{2j}\}:Z \rightarrow A$ is in $\text{Drv}(e_2)$ and $\forall i, j \text{ Eqv}(id_{1i}, id_{2j})$, then $\{id_{1i}, id_{2j}\}:Z \rightarrow A$ is in $\text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)$.

[7] $\text{Drv}(e_1 - e_2)$ — Use $\text{Drv}(e_1)$.

We will say that e is consistent (with respect to s) if for no domain X and for no distinct values V_1, V_2 are both $X \equiv V_1$ and $X \equiv V_2$ members of $\text{Drv}(e)$. It is meaningless to try to derive constraints on expressions which are not consistent. \square

Our algorithm now consists of the functions Drv , Cl and Eqv . With these rules, a solution may be proposed to Problem 2 posed earlier:

Proposition. Given a schema s and an expression e , an EQ $e:X=Y$ or $e:X \equiv V$ is valid if and only if it is in $\text{Drv}(e)$; an FD $e:Z \rightarrow A$ is valid if and only if for some subset $Z_1 \subseteq Z$, $e:Z_1 \rightarrow A$ is in $\text{Drv}(e)$ ⁵.

The verification of this proposition has two parts. First, are the rules sound? That is, are any invalid FDs or EQs generated? Second, are the rules complete? Do they find all of

⁵ We have left out the augmentation rule, but this notion of soundness/completeness means that the rule can always be applied as the very last step in a derivation.

the valid FDs and EQs? The question of soundness is considered in the next section.

4. Soundness of the Algorithm

The formal development of the operator Drv was in three parts: First, Eqv was defined; then we defined the closure rules using Eqv , and finally the derivable constraints Drv in terms of closure and Eqv . To prove the soundness of the rules, we first prove some properties of Eqv and Cl and then properties of Drv .

Functional dependencies, as their name implies, are closely related to ordinary mathematical functions. If, say, in $R(n)$ there is the FD $Z \rightarrow A$, then given any state st , the projection $R[Z,A](st)$ defines a partial function $U^k \rightarrow U$, where k is the number of domains in Z (and U is the data universe of the state). Similarly, given any state, FD identifiers define partial functions. It is convenient to take as the domain of these latter functions the set of infinite sequences of elements of the universe. In this way, all functions will have the same domain. The function we associate with an identifier will then actually depend only on the positions in the sequence corresponding to the integer labels of the leaves of id . That is, if, for example, the leaves of id are 2,5,7, then in an argument (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) , only values x_2, x_5 and x_7 will affect the value of the function. Given a state st , we will denote the function determined by an identifier id by $id(st)$ or $id(st;)$. We will first define the functions determined by identifiers,

and then we will compare these functions with the FDs to which the FD identifiers are attached.

The partial function $id(st)$ whose domain is the set of sequences of universe elements is defined by the following Algol-like procedure, where x is a sequence of domain values:

```

id(st;x) =
  if id is a domain leaf i then  $x_i$ 
  else if id is a value leaf ' $v$ ' then  $v$ 
  (*) else if succ(id) is an integer node then succ(id)(st;x)
  else /* succ(id) is a relation name R; root(id) is a
        domain A, and the set of children of R is
        { $id_1, \dots, id_n$ } whose roots are labelled  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$  */
    if  $id_1(st;x), \dots, id_n(st;x)$  are defined
      then begin
         $v_1 \leftarrow id_1(st;x);$ 
        ...
         $v_n \leftarrow id_n(st;x);$ 
        if  $R[Z_1, \dots, Z_n = v_1, \dots, v_n][A](st) = \{a\}$ 
          /* i.e., if there is a tuple in R(st) whose
             Z-values equal the v's */
          then  $a$  /* i.e., return the unique A-value */
          else undefined
        end
      else undefined
  end

```

Now identifiers were not associated with FDs in a haphazard fashion. They were chosen so that the function determined by the identifier essentially equals the function determined by the

FD. To decide, as in rule [8] of the definition of closure, if $A_1=A_2$ should be inferred from $id_1:Z \rightarrow A_1$ and $id_2:Z \rightarrow A_2$ is then a question of deciding if $id_1(st) = id_2(st)$ for all states st , i.e., if the functions determined by the identifiers are equal. We are given as an hypothesis of rule [8] in the definition of closure the truth of $Eqv(id_1, id_2)$. Hence, we need to know that the truth of Eqv means equality of the identifier functions. This is proved in the following theorem:

Theorem 1. Let s be a schema and suppose id_1 and id_2 are associated with FDs derived on expressions over s . Then $Eqv(id_1, id_2)$ true implies that for all states st and value sequences x , if $id_1(st;x)$ and $id_2(st;x)$ are defined, then they are equal.

Proof. The proof may be found in the appendix. \square

To prove completeness, it will be necessary to know that the converse of the above theorem will hold. This is proved in the next theorem.

Theorem 2. Let s be a schema and let id_1 and id_2 be associated with FDs derived on expressions over s . Then $Eqv(id_1, id_2)$ false implies that there exists a state st and a value sequence x such that $id_1(st;x)$ and $id_2(st;x)$ are defined and unequal.

Proof. This is immediate from the definition of Eqv : Take st to be the "free state" $fstr$ and the value sequence x to be V . \square

We have claimed that the function determined by an FD $Z \rightarrow A$ defined on an expression e is essentially the same as the function determined by the associated identifier. The precise

meaning of "essentially" is the following: Suppose a state st and a sequence x is given. The values of x which are relevant to the FD are $x[Z]$. The application of the function to the input x corresponds to the selection expression $e[Z \equiv x[Z]]$. To extract the A-value, the projection $e[Z \equiv x[Z]][A]$ is used. If the function is defined at st and x , there is one element in $e[Z \equiv x[Z]][A](st)$, otherwise it is empty. The "essential" equality is then $a \in e[Z \equiv x[Z]][A](st)$ if and only if $id(st;x)$ is defined and equal to a ⁶. We do not prove this equality separately but together with the soundness statement itself below.

With the above constructions, we can prove the soundness of the closure operator. We hypothesize two properties of a set S of constraints. One property says that all elements of S are valid constraints. The other property is a statement that FD identifiers "agree" with the FDs as discussed above. The theorem then states that the closure operator preserves these two properties. Of course, we are primarily interested in the preservation of validity. However, the second property is needed during the induction steps and for the completeness theorem.

Theorem 3. Let s be a schema and e an expression over s , and consider the following two statements:

- (i) every constraint in the set is valid;
- (ii) for every FD $\{id_i\}:Z \rightarrow A$ in the set, for every state and

⁶ There is no obvious way to adjust FD identifiers for an augmentation rule. If the identifier for, say, $Z \parallel X \rightarrow A$ is the same as for $Z \rightarrow A$, then the above relationship will only hold in the "only if" direction.

every sequence x of universe elements, $a \in e[Z \equiv x[Z]][A](st)$ if and only if $a = id_i(st; x)$ for some id_i .

Let S be a set of EQs and labelled FDs defined on an expression e such that (i) and (ii) hold on S . Then (i) and (ii) hold on $Cl(S)$.

Proof. The proof uses induction on the length of the derivation and can be found in the appendix. \square

With this theorem, it is now easy to show the soundness of *Drv*: (We again must prove the extra clause (ii) as in Theorem 3.)

Theorem 4. Let s be a schema, and let e be an expression over s . Then statements (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3 hold on the set $Drv(e)$.

Proof. This proof uses induction on the number of relational algebra operators in e and can be found in the appendix. \square

Corollary. Let s be a schema and e be an expression over s . Then every EQ in $Drv(e)$ is valid, and every FD $e:Z \rightarrow A$ such that $Z_1 \rightarrow A$ is in $Drv(e)$ for some $Z_1 \subseteq Z$ is valid.

5. Completeness of the Algorithm

We now know that *Drv* does not generate any invalid constraints. The next step in a solution to the problem of calculating constraints on relational algebra expressions is to prove completeness: Does *Drv* generate all of the valid constraints?

As we have defined Drv , the answer is no, Drv does not generate all valid constraints. The following example illustrates this:

$s_1: R(2), S(2), R:1 \rightarrow 2$

$e: (R \cup S) - (S - R)$

$Drv(R \cup S) = \emptyset$

$Drv(e) = \emptyset$

Clearly, the expression $(R \cup S) - (S - R)$ is equivalent to R , and therefore the FD $1 \rightarrow 2$ is valid in $(R \cup S) - (S - R)$. However, the rules calculate no FDs on e . It seems, then, that the constraint formula for set difference must have some knowledge of when formulas are equivalent so that it can recognize, at least as far as FDs and EQs are concerned, $(R \cup S) - (S - R)$ as being equivalent to R . It turns out, however, that this is impossible: Functional dependencies are sufficient to capture the notion of equivalence of two expressions, and this problem is undecidable.

The following definition specifies what we mean by equivalence, and the next theorem shows the relationship between FDs and the equivalence property:

Let s be a schema, and let e_1 and e_2 be expressions over s of degree n . Then e_1 and e_2 are equivalent (with respect to s), written $e_1 \equiv e_2$, if for every state st , $e_1(st) \equiv e_2(st)$. ||

Theorem 5. Let s be a schema, and let R be an n -ary relation over s such that for every domain X of R , the FD $R: \emptyset \rightarrow X$ is in s . If e_1 and e_2 are expressions of degree n which do not contain R , then $e_1 \equiv e_2$ if and only if every possible FD $\emptyset \rightarrow X$ is

valid in the expression $E = R \cup (e_1 - e_2) \cup (e_2 - e_1)$.

Proof. If $e_1 \equiv e_2$, then it is immediate that for every state st , $E(st) = R(st)$, and so every FD $\phi \rightarrow X$ is valid in E . Now suppose $e_1 \not\equiv e_2$. This means that there is some state st and some tuple t such that either $t \in e_1(st)$ and $t \notin e_2(st)$, or $t \in e_2(st)$ and $t \notin e_1(st)$. In either case, $t \in ((e_1 - e_2) \cup (e_2 - e_1))(st)$. Let $t' \neq t$ be any tuple not in $(e_1 \cup e_2)(st)$. (If $(e_1 \cup e_2)(st) = U^n$, we can extend the universe U by adding one more element u , and we can then construct tuple t' from u .) Because R does not appear in either e_1 or e_2 , we may assume that $R(st) = \{t'\}$. Then $E(st)$ contains both t and t' and therefore some FD $\phi \rightarrow X$ is not true in $E(st)$. \square

It is also possible to prove this theorem without using the new relation R , that is, by only using relations appearing in e_1 and e_2 .

This theorem will be enough to show the impossibility of calculating all valid FDs on arbitrary relational algebra expressions. This is because the problem of determining the equivalence of two relational algebra expressions is undecidable as the following theorem states:

Theorem 6. Let s be a schema. The following problem is undecidable:

Given arbitrary relational expressions e_1 and e_2 over s of degree n , determine if $e_1 \equiv e_2$.

Proof. The proof is based on a similar theorem by M. Solomon[Solo] and can be found in the appendix. \square

With this undecidability result, we can prove the undecidability of calculating constraints on expressions:

Theorem 7. The problem of determining all valid constraints in a given relational expression of syntax (I) over a given schema is undecidable.

Proof. If there were a procedure for calculating all constraints valid in a relational algebra expression, then by Theorem 5 there would be a procedure for determining the equivalence of relational algebra expressions. But this latter problem is undecidable by Theorem 6. ||

Given this undecidability result, we next ask what changes can be made to the mapping language which will allow a decidable complete set of derivation rules.

There are two easy-to-specify restrictions which can be placed on the relational algebra syntax which will eliminate the above incompleteness. One restriction is to allow relation names to appear at most once in an expression. Then expressions such as $(R \setminus S) - S$ will not be allowed, and the constraints valid on a set difference will always be exactly the ones valid on the first component of the difference.

Another restriction is to disallow set difference as a relational algebra operator. Without set difference, we cannot perform the reduction of Theorem 4, and the complete calculation of constraints on relational algebra expressions not using set difference will be possible. This second restriction is the one we shall investigate.

Let us consider, then, the language of syntax (II) in which set difference has been omitted. Does completeness hold now? With this language, the answer is still no, not all FDs and EQs are detected.

Before we give a counterexample (pointed out by E.F. Codd), we will briefly discuss certain behavior of joins of projections. For this discussion only, we will use different notation which will allow examples of such joins to be written more succinctly. The example relation R will have domains named A , B and C . A join, denoted by ' \bowtie ' will be understood to be an equi-join on the like-named domains of its components, and it will eliminate one of the joined domains.

Ordinarily, a join of projections such as $R[AC] \bowtie R[BC]$ will contain all the tuples in R , plus extra tuples, i.e., $R \subset R[AC] \bowtie R[BC]$, but $R \neq R[AC] \bowtie R[BC]$. Take the following example:

R	$R[AC]$	$R[BC]$	$R[AC] \bowtie R[BC]$
<u>A B C</u>	<u>A C</u>	<u>B C</u>	<u>A B C</u>
0 1 2	0 2	1 2	0 1 2
3 4 2	3 2	4 2	0 4 2
			3 1 2
			3 4 2

If enough structure is added to R , namely in the form of FDs, then no extra tuples will appear in the join; that is, the join will be "non-loss". In our example, the FD $C \rightarrow B$ is sufficient to cause R to have a non-loss join. (The above example violates the FD $C \rightarrow B$.) General necessary and sufficient conditions for a relation to have a non-loss join are given in [AhBU].

Now let us return to constructing a counterexample to the

completeness problem. We use the relation R as above (returning to the usual notation) and add a second FD $1,2 \rightarrow 3$ to the FD $3 \rightarrow 2$ already mentioned. We have:

s: $R(3)$, $R:1,2 \rightarrow 3$, $R:3 \rightarrow 2$

$\text{Drv}(R[1,3]) = \emptyset$

$\text{Drv}(R[2,3]) = \{2 \rightarrow 1, 1 \rightarrow 1, 2 \rightarrow 2, 1,2 \rightarrow 1, 1,2 \rightarrow 2\}$

$\text{Drv}(R[1,3][2=2]R[2,3]) = \{4 \rightarrow 3, 2 \rightarrow 3, 1 \rightarrow 1, \dots\}$

$\text{Drv}((R[1,3][2=2]R[2,3])[1,3,4]) = \{3 \rightarrow 2, 1 \rightarrow 1, \dots\}$

(The ellipsis represents the trivial FDs arising from the reflexive rule.) Yet, we know that for any state st, that

$$R(\text{st}) = (R[1,3][2=2]R[2,3])[1,3,4](\text{st}),$$

i.e., that R has a non-loss join. (The expression on the right corresponds to $R[AC] \bowtie R[BC]$.) Therefore, the FD $1,2 \rightarrow 3$ is valid in the expression, but it is not calculated by Drv.

Intuitively, it is not hard to see why this happened. The FD $1,2 \rightarrow 3$ was lost through a projection, but the later join was non-loss and so the FD reappeared. This problem can be eliminated by restricting the mapping language. The problem arose by doing projections and then undoing them by joins. A restricted mapping language which does all joins (formally, cross products) before any projections will be just as powerful as the unrestricted language and will not cause Drv to lose any FDs as happened above. This is what the third version of the relational algebra syntax does. It first allows cross products on base relations or selections. Then restrictions are allowed, and lastly, union and projections are allowed. (The reason

selections are moved inward to base relations will be given later.)

In order to show that syntax (III) is just as powerful as syntax (II), we show that every syntax-(II)-expression can be transformed to an equivalent syntax-(III)-expression. The transformations move cross products inward until their operands are either base relations, selections or other cross products. They also move selections in to base relations. The following theorem accomplishes this:

Theorem 8. Let s be a schema, and let e_1 , e_2 and e_3 be expressions over s . Then the following equivalences are valid:

- [1a] $e_1[X] \times e_2 \equiv (e_1 \times e_2)[X, D_2]$,
where D_2 is $\text{deg}(e_1)+1, \text{deg}(e_1)+2, \dots, \text{deg}(e_1)+\text{deg}(e_2)$
- [1b] $e_1 \times (e_2[X]) \equiv (e_1 \times e_2)[D_1, X']$, where $X' = X + \text{deg}(e_1)$ and D_1 is $1, 2, \dots, \text{deg}(e_1)$
- [2a] $e_1[X=Y] \times e_2 \equiv (e_1 \times e_2)[X=Y]$
- [2b] $e_1 \times (e_2[X=Y]) \equiv (e_1 \times e_2)[X'=Y']$,
where $X' = X + \text{deg}(e_1)$ and $Y' = Y + \text{deg}(e_1)$
- [3a] $(e_1 \cup e_2) \times e_3 \equiv (e_1 \times e_3) \cup (e_2 \times e_3)$
- [3b] $e_1 \times (e_2 \cup e_3) \equiv (e_1 \times e_2) \cup (e_1 \times e_3)$
- [4] $e[X][Y \equiv V] \equiv e[Y' \equiv V][X]$, where $X[Y] = Y'$
- [5] $e[X=Y][Z \equiv V] \equiv e[Z \equiv V][X=Y]$
- [6] $(e_1 \cup e_2)[X \equiv V] \equiv e_1[X \equiv V] \cup e_2[X \equiv V]$
- [7a] $(e_1 \times e_2)[X \equiv V] \equiv e_1[X \equiv V] \times e_2$, where $X \leq \text{deg}(e_1)$
- [7b] $(e_1 \times e_2)[X \equiv V] \equiv e_1 \times (e_2[X' \equiv V])$, where $X > \text{deg}(e_1)$ and $X' = X - \text{deg}(e_1)$
- [8] $e[X][Y=Z] \equiv e[Y'=Z'][X]$, where $Y' = X[Y]$ and $Z' = X[Z]$
- [9] $(e_1 \cup e_2)[X=Y] \equiv e_1[X=Y] \cup e_2[X=Y]$

Proof. The proof is straightforward and is omitted. ||

The equivalences of Theorem 8 can be viewed as transformation rules: Given an expression e according to syntax (II), match some part of e with the left-hand-side of an equivalence of Theorem 8 to produce a new expression e' from the right-hand-side of the equivalence. Repeat the process with e' . Continue as long as possible. The result will be an expression according to syntax (III) which is equivalent to e . We record this result in the following theorem.

Theorem 9. Every expression of syntax (II) is equivalent to an expression of syntax (III). \square

By this theorem, we are justified in assuming that all expressions conform to syntax III.

Before we continue with the completeness problem, let us review the example which was used to show that Drv was not complete for syntax-(II)-expressions. Recall that we had a relation $R(3)$ with FDs $1,2 \rightarrow 3$ and $3 \rightarrow 2$. For the expression

$(R[1,3][2=2]R[2,3])[1,3,4]$,

we calculated

$$Drv((R[1,3][2=2]R[2,3])[1,3,4]) = \{3 \rightarrow 2, \dots\}.$$

In actual fact, the FD $1,2 \rightarrow 3$ is also valid but is not calculated by Drv . Let us see what happens by applying the above equivalence transformations. One of the two possible transformations is:

$(R[1,3][2=2]R[2,3])[1,3,4] \rightarrow$ (by [1a])

$(R[3=2]R[2,3])[1,3,4,5][1,3,4] \rightarrow$ (by [1b])

$(R[3=3]R)[1,2,3,5,6][1,3,4,5][1,3,4]$.

We calculate the constraints valid in this last expression as follows:

$Drv(R) = \{1,2 \rightarrow 3 \quad 3 \rightarrow 2 \quad \dots\}$

$Drv(R[3=3]R) = \{1,2 \rightarrow 3 \quad 3 \rightarrow 2 \quad 3=6 \quad 4,5 \rightarrow 6 \quad 6 \rightarrow 5 \quad 1,2 \rightarrow 6$
 $6 \rightarrow 2 \quad 4,5 \rightarrow 2 \quad 4,5 \rightarrow 3 \quad 3 \rightarrow 5 \quad 2=5 \quad 1,5 \rightarrow 3$
 $2,4 \rightarrow 6 \quad 1,5 \rightarrow 6 \quad 2,4 \rightarrow 3 \quad \dots\}$

($3 \rightarrow 2$ and $3 \rightarrow 5$ are the same FD)

$Drv((R[3=3]R)[1,2,3,5,6]) = \{1,2 \rightarrow 3 \quad 3 \rightarrow 2 \quad 3=5 \quad 5 \rightarrow 4 \quad 1,2 \rightarrow 5$
 $5 \rightarrow 2 \quad 3 \rightarrow 4 \quad 2=4 \quad 1,4 \rightarrow 3 \quad 1,4 \rightarrow 5 \quad \dots\}$

$Drv((R[3=3]R)[1,2,3,5,6][1,3,4,5]) = \{2=4 \quad 4 \rightarrow 3 \quad 2 \rightarrow 3 \quad 1,3 \rightarrow 2$
 $1,3 \rightarrow 4 \quad \dots\}$

$Drv((R[3=3]R)[1,2,3,5,6][1,3,4,5][1,3,4]) = \{3 \rightarrow 2 \quad 1,2 \rightarrow 3 \quad \dots\}$

These are exactly the constraints in R (to which the expression is equivalent). The counterexample is no longer a problem, and this is an intuitive argument that completeness holds for the restricted syntax.

In the above discussions, we have first removed set difference from the mapping language, and then we restricted the syntax so that cross products are performed before projections. With these restrictions we can finally prove completeness of the derivation rules. We begin with a theorem which proves completeness for expressions without the restriction operator (syntax IV), and then we prove it for any expression of syntax III.

Theorem 10. Let s be a schema; let e be a consistent expression over s expressed in syntax IV. Then any valid EQ on e is a member of $\text{Drv}(e)$, and if $Z \rightarrow A$ is valid on e , then for some $Z_1 \subseteq Z$, $Z_1 \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e)$.

Proof. Proofs of completeness theorems generally follow the contrapositive direction: If c is not a member of $\text{Drv}(e)$, i.e., if c is not derivable by the given rules, then c is not valid, i.e., there is some state st such that c is false in $e(st)$. The state st is called a counterexample state. In the proofs of completeness for FDs and for MVDs[BeFH], the counterexample state is a single set of tuples since only one relation is being dealt with. In the present situation there are (possibly) many relations, each of which must be assigned a set of tuples for the counterexample state. This cannot be done in as straightforward a fashion as in the case for one relation because the expression e may have several occurrences of the same base relation. For example, suppose e has the form $e_1 \times e_2$ and that base relation R appears in both e_1 and e_2 . If we try to arrive at an assignment of tuples to R by a recursive procedure (which is natural since relation algebra expressions are recursively defined), the procedure call on e_1 may result in an assignment to R which conflicts with that of the procedure call on e_2 . In the proof of this theorem, which can be found in the appendix, we are able to overcome this problem because of the special structure of operations embodied in syntax IV. We first use results by other authors for the case of base relations and selections on base relations. Then for cross products of selections, we show how counterexample tuple sets on subexpressions

can be integrated into the whole expression. The case of union uses Theorem 2, and the case for projection is straightforward.

□

Now we want to use this theorem to prove completeness for expressions of syntax III, which contain restriction operators. We do this by defining a transformation from expressions of syntax III to those of syntax IV; that is, it is a transformation which removes occurrences of the restriction operator. This transformation will not be an equivalence, but it will have two properties which will be sufficient for our purposes. Namely, the resultant expression will (have values which will) always be a subset of the original expression, and the resultant expression will have the same set of derivable constraints as the original. We need to use this indirect approach because if we tried a direct inductive argument for a restriction $e[X=Y]$ we could get a counterexample state on e ; but after applying the restriction operator $[X=Y]$, we could never be sure that the tuples were still present.

Let s be a schema and let e be an expression over s according to syntax III. We may write e as $r_1[X_1] \cup \dots \cup r_n[X_n]$, where each r_i is a restriction of a cross product (see the definition of syntax III). The expression $G(e)$ over s conforming to syntax IV is defined as follows:

Let r be one of the terms r_1, \dots, r_n , and let $X=Y$ be one of the restrictions in r . Let r^* be r with the restriction $X=Y$ removed. Next, there are three cases: $X=V \in \text{Drv}(r^*)$ for some V ; $Y=V \in \text{Drv}(r^*)$ for some V ; and no $V \in \text{Drv}(r^*)$ on X or Y is in $\text{Drv}(r^*)$. In the first case replace r by $r^*[Y=V]$; in the second case

replace r by $r^*[X \equiv V]$, and in the third case replace r by $r^*[X \equiv V_1][Y \equiv V_1] \cup r^*[X \equiv V_2][Y \equiv V_2]$, where $V_1 \neq V_2$, and neither V_1 nor V_2 appear in e or in s . Now rearrange the resulting expression so that it is again of the form $r_1[X_1] \cup \dots \cup r_n[X_n]$, where each r_i is a restriction of a cross product. The new expression will have one less restriction than the original. Repeat this process until there are no more restrictions. The result is $G(e)$. \square

Theorem 11. Let s be a schema, and let e be an expression over s of syntax III. Then $\text{Drv}(G(e)) = \text{Drv}(e)$, and for every structure str , $G(e)(\text{str}) \subseteq e(\text{str})$.

Proof. The proof may be found in the appendix. \square

The goal of this paper now appears as a simple corollary of Theorem 11:

Theorem 12. Let s be a schema, and let e be a consistent expression over s expressed in syntax III. Then any valid EQ on e is a member of $\text{Drv}(e)$, and if $Z \rightarrow A$ is valid on e , then for some $Z_1 \subseteq Z$, $Z_1 \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e)$.

Proof. Suppose e is consistent and $c \notin \text{Drv}(e)$. Since e is consistent, $G(e)$ is consistent. If c is an EQ not in $\text{Drv}(e) = \text{Drv}(G(e))$, or if it is an FD $Z \rightarrow A$ such that $Z_1 \rightarrow A \notin \text{Drv}(e) = \text{Drv}(G(e))$ for every $Z_1 \subseteq Z$, then by Theorem 10, there is a state st such that c is false in $G(e)(\text{st})$. Since $G(e)(\text{st}) \subseteq e(\text{st})$, c is also false in $e(\text{st})$. \square

6. Summary and Conclusions

This paper has presented results about calculating functional dependencies on relational algebra expressions. The motivation for studying this problem arose from the desire to be able to determine correct view mappings. A correct view mapping is one in which the constraints in the underlying schema and the properties of the mapping ensure that the constraints in the view schema are always satisfied (in the view). Given the underlying schema, the view schema and the mapping, we need a decision procedure to tell us the correctness or incorrectness of the mapping. This is a basic prerequisite for implementing multilevel database systems[ANSI].

The basic facilities of view mappings can be modelled by relational algebra, and a basic type of constraint appearing in schemas is the functional dependency; hence, the problem of recognizing correct view mappings is in large part the problem of calculating the valid functional dependencies on relational algebra expressions over the underlying schema. We studied this problem in detail in the preceding sections.

The results were both negative and positive. We found that the problem as stated is simply unsolvable. If we drop the set difference operator from relational algebra, we found that there is an algorithm for calculating functional dependencies on relational algebra expressions. The algorithm makes use of the derivation rules already known for functional dependencies on one relation, but it is complicated by the need to compare

derivations of functional dependencies. With suitable modification to the relational algebra language which does not decrease its power, we have shown that the algorithm is both sound — no invalid functional dependencies are accepted — and complete — all valid functional dependencies are found.

In terms of the feasibility of constructing the mapping processors in the framework of the ANSI/X3/SPARC Study Group, we may conclude that the processors can in principle be constructed, but care must be taken in the design of the mapping language, or else the processors cannot exactly determine the correct mappings.

We are currently working on a number of logical extensions to this work:

Although functional dependencies are very important constraint types, they are not the only ones which have a wide applicability. For example, there are constraints in hierarchical models which require that each child segment occurrence have a parent. In Codasyl network models, a similar construct is that a record type has mandatory membership in a set type. In relational models we have what are called foreign key constraints. These are all cases of what we call subset constraints. Their interaction with functional dependencies and mappings is being investigated.

In this paper we only studied structure mappings. A complete view specification will also include operation mappings. An operation applied to the view must be mapped to operations on the underlying relations such that the effect will be as if the

view were operated on directly. We are currently investigating sound and complete algorithms for this type of problem.

7. References

- [ABCE] Astrahan M.M., Blasgen M.W., Chamberlin D.D., Eswaran K.P., Gray J.N., Griffiths P.P., King W.F., Lorie R.A., McJones P.R., Mehl J.W., Putzolu G.R., Traiger I.L., Wade B.W. and Watson V. "System R: Relational Approach to Database Management" ACM-TODS 1, 2, pp.97-137, 1976
- [AhBU] Aho A.V., Beeri C. and Ullman J.D. "The Theory of Joins in Relational Databases" Proc. 18th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Computer Science, 1977
- [ANSI] "The ANSI/X3/SPARC Framework: Report of the Study Group on Data Base Management Systems" D.Tsichritzis and A.Klug (eds.), AFIPS Press, 1977
- [Arms] Armstrong W.W. "Dependency Structures of Data Base Relationships" Information Processing 74, North Holland Pub. Co., 1974
- [BeFH] Beeri C., Fagin R. and Howard J.H. "A Complete Axiomatization for Functional and Multivalued Dependencies in Database Relations" Proc. ACM-SIGMOD Conf. 1977
- [Bern] Bernstein P. "Synthesizing Third Normal Form Relations from Functional Dependencies," ACM-TODS, 1, pp.277-298, 1976
- [ChGT] Chamberlin D.D., Gray J.N. and Traiger I.L. "Views, Authorization and Locking in a Relational Data Base System" AFIPS Conference Proceedings, 44, 1975

- [Codd] Codd E.F. "Relational completeness of Data Base Sub-languages" Data Base Systems, R. Rustin (ed.), Prentice Hall, 1972
- [Henk] Henkin L. "The Completeness of the First-Order Functional Calculus" J. Symbolic Logic, 14, pp.159-166, 1949
- [Klug] Klug A. "Theory of Database Mappings," Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1978
- [Solo] Solomon M. "Undecidability of the Equivalence Problem for Relational Expressions" Bell Laboratories, to appear

8. Appendix: Proofs of Selected Theorems

Theorem 1. Let s be a schema and suppose id_1 and id_2 are associated with FDs derived on expression over s . Then $Eqv(id_1, id_2)$ true implies that for all states st and value sequences x , if $id_1(st; x)$ and $id_2(st; x)$ are defined, then they are equal.

Proof. By removing unnecessary tuples, we may consider the given state st to be the result of a procedure $gentabl$ in which the `new_formal_value` function is replaced by a function not necessarily generating unique values. Suppose we apply $gentabl$ to id_1 and id_2 , obtaining a structure str_1 . Clearly, any equality relationships holding in the free structure $fstr$ (before applying the `infervals` procedure) will also hold on the analogous tuples in str_1 . Now apply `infervals` to str_1 and $fstr$. This will not change the above property: Any equality holding in $fstr$ will still hold on analogous tuples in str_1 . But str_1 is already a state, hence $id_1(fstr, V) = id_2(fstr, V)$ implies $id_1(str_1; x) = id_2(str_1; x)$, i.e., $id_1(st; x) = id_2(st; x)$. \square

Theorem 3. Let s be a schema and e be an expression over s , and consider the following two statements:

- (i) Every constraint in the set is valid;
- (ii) for every FD $\{id_i\}: Z \rightarrow A$ in the set, for every state st and every sequence x of universe elements, $a \in e[Z \equiv x[Z]][A](st)$ if and only if for some i , $id_i(st; x) = a$.

Let S be a set of EQs and labelled FDs defined on an expression e such that (i) and (ii) hold on S . Then (i) and (ii) hold on $Cl(S)$.

Proof. We assume (i) and (ii) hold on S.

If $c \in Cl(S)$ is present by one of clauses [1] through [5], then property (i) holds because of the basic properties of equality.

If $id: X \rightarrow Y \in Cl(S)$ because $X=Y \in Cl(S)$ (clause [6]), then $X \rightarrow Y$ is valid because equality is functional (and valid by the induction hypothesis). Also, for any state st and sequence x , $a \in e[X \equiv x[X]][Y](st)$ if and only if for some $t \in e(st)$, $x[X] = t[X] = t[Y] = a$; i.e., if and only if $a = id(st;x)$.

If $id: \emptyset \rightarrow X \in Cl(S)$ because $X \equiv V \in Cl(S)$ (clause [7]), then $\emptyset \rightarrow X$ is valid because the X domain is constant. Also, for any state st and sequence x , $a \in e[\emptyset \equiv x[\emptyset]][X](st) = e[X](st)$, if and only if $a = V = id(st;x)$.

Suppose that $\{id_{1i}\}: Z \rightarrow A_1$ and $\{id_{2j}\}: Z \rightarrow A_2$ are in $Cl(S)$ and that statement (ii) above is true for them and also that $Eqv(id_{1i}, id_{2j}) = true$ for all i, j . Then for every state st and any $t \in e(st)$, $t[A_1] \in e[Z \equiv t[Z]][A_1](st)$, so for some i , $t[A_1] = id_{1i}(st;t)$. Similarly, for some j , $t[A_2] = id_{2j}(st;t)$. Hence $t[A_1] = t[A_2]$ and so $A_1 = A_2$ is valid for e .

Suppose $id_{1i}: Z \rightarrow A$ and $id_{2j}: A \cup X \rightarrow B$ are in $Cl(S)$ and satisfy (i) and (ii), and that $id_{3ij}: Z \cup X \rightarrow B$ is obtained per clause [9]. By inspection of the algorithm, we can see that $id_{3ij}(st)(x) = id_{2j}(st)(x[id_{1i}(st)(x)/A])$ (where $x[y/k]$ denotes the sequence obtained from x by putting y at position k). By definition, $b \in e[Z \cup X \equiv x[Z \cup X]][B](st)$ if and only if there is a $t \in e(st)$ such that $t[B] = b$ and $t[Z \cup X] = x[Z \cup X]$. This is true if and only if there is a $t \in e(st)$ such that $t[B] = b$ and $t[A \cup X] = x[t[A]/A][A \cup X]$ and $t[Z] = x[Z]$. By induction, we know that $b \in e[A \cup X \equiv x[t[A]/A][A \cup X]][B](st)$ if and only if $b =$

$id_{2j}(st; x[t[A]/A])$, and that $t[A] \in e[Z \equiv x[Z]][A](st)$ if and only if $t[A] = id_{1i}(st; x)$. Hence $b \in e[Z \cup X \equiv x[Z \cup X]][B](st)$ if and only if $b = id_{2j}(st; x[t[A]/A]) = id_{3ij}(st; x)$. \square

Theorem 4. Let s be a schema, and let e be an expression over s . Then statements (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3 hold on the set $Drv(e)$.

Proof. This proof is quite straightforward, with most of the work having been done in the previous theorem. We will only show how clause (ii) proceeds for projection and how clause (i) proceeds for union:

Suppose $id_2: Z \rightarrow A \in Drv(e[X])$, where $id_1: X[Z] \rightarrow X[A]$ is in $Drv(e)$ and id_2 is as described in clause [2]. First note that $id_2(st)(x) = id_1(st)(x')$, where $x' = x[x[Z]/X[Z]]$. Then $a \in e[X][Z=x[Z]][A](st)$ if and only if there is a $t \in e(st)$ such that $a = t[X][A] = t[X[A]]$ and $t[X[Z]] = t[X][Z] = x[Z] = x'[X[Z]]$, i.e., if and only if $a \in e[X[Z]=x'[X[Z]]][X[A]](st)$, which means, by induction, that $a = id_1(st)(x') = id_2(st)(x)$.

For union, suppose e is $e_1 \cup e_2$ and that $\{id_{1i}, id_{2j}\}: Z \rightarrow A \in Drv(e)$, where $\{id_{1i}\}: Z \rightarrow A \in Drv(e_1)$, and $\{id_{2j}\}: Z \rightarrow A \in Drv(e_2)$ and $Eqv(id_{1i}, id_{2j}) \forall i, j$. Suppose t, t' are in $e(st)$ and that $t[Z] = t'[Z]$. There is some id_{km} ($k=1$ or 2) such that $t[A] = id_{km}(st; t)$ and there is some id_{1n} ($l=1$ or 2) such that $t'[A] = id_{1n}(st; t)$. Regardless of the values of k and l , we have $Eqv(id_{km}, id_{1n})$, and so $t[A] = t'[A]$. \square

Theorem 5. Let s be a schema. The following problem is undecidable:

Given arbitrary relational expressions e_1 and e_2 over s of degree n , determine if $e_1 \equiv e_2$.

Proof. Let us say that two expressions e_1 and e_2 are strongly equivalent (with respect to some schema s) if $e_1(\text{str}) = e_2(\text{str})$ for all structures str for s . In [Solo] it is proved that the strong equivalence problem is undecidable when the expressions do not contain selections. Clearly, the problem is still undecidable when selections can also appear. From this we conclude that equivalence problem (i) is undecidable since an algorithm for it would still work when the schema contains no constraints.

As an aside, we will show that we can also reduce equivalence problem (i) to the strong equivalence problem:

First we show how to express constraints as relational algebra equalities: An FD $R:Z \rightarrow A$ is true in a structure str if and only if $(R[Z=Z]R)[A=A'](\text{str}) = (R[Z=Z]R)(\text{str})$, where $A' = A + \text{deg}(R)$; a DEQ $R:X=Y$ is true in str if and only if $R[X=Y](\text{str}) = R(\text{str})$, and a VEQ $R:X=V$ is true in str if and only if $R[X=V](\text{str}) = R(\text{str})$.

Given a schema s , let L be the cross product of the left-hand-sides of every equality as above corresponding to each constraint in s , and let R be the cross product of the corresponding right-hand-sides. Note that $L(\text{str}) = R(\text{str})$ if and only if str is a state, and that $L(\text{str}) \subseteq R(\text{str})$ for all structures str . Now suppose that the relations in s are R_1, \dots, R_n . Define the expression $W = R_1[1] \cup \dots \cup R_n[1]$. Then W has degree 1, and $W(\text{str}) = \emptyset$ if and only if $R(\text{str}) = \emptyset$ for each $R \in s$. Now define $E = W - (W \times (R - L))[1]$. This expression has the property that $E(\text{str}) = \emptyset$ if and only if str is not a state or str is empty.

We now have the reduction: $e_1 \equiv e_2$ if and only if $e_1 \times E$ is strongly equivalent to $e_2 \times E$. \square

Theorem 10. Let s be a schema; let e be an expression over s according to syntax IV be consistent. Then any valid EQ on e is a member of $\text{Drv}(e)$, and if $Z \rightarrow A$ is valid on e , then for some $Z_1 \subseteq Z$, $Z_1 \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e)$.

Proof. First consider a selection $e = R[X_1 \equiv V_1] \dots [X_m \equiv V_m]$, where X_i, V_i are single domains or values, respectively. We first define a set of equivalence classes of domains $\{E_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ determined by the EQ constraints on e . This will allow us to remove EQs from consideration and to utilize existing theorems on the completeness of rules for FDs.

For each set E_i we associate a value V_i : If $X \in E_i$ and $X \equiv V \in \text{Drv}(R)$, then $V_i = V$. (This value will be unique if it exists since R is consistent.) Otherwise, V_i is an arbitrary, unique integer. (Hence, $i \neq j$ implies $V_i \neq V_j$.) We first define a state st_1 such that $e(st_1)$ contains only one tuple t . Namely, t is such that $t[X] = V_j$ if and only if $X \in E_j$. Note that since $R(st_1)$ has a cardinality of one, all FDs are true in $R(st_1)$. Now, if $X=Y$ is not derivable, then for some i and j , $X \in E_i$, $Y \in E_j$, and $i \neq j$. Hence (in $e(st_1)$), $t[X] = V_i$, $t[Y] = V_j$, and so $t[X] \neq t[Y]$. The state st_1 is therefore a counterexample state showing that $e: X=Y$ is not valid.

Similarly, if $X \equiv V$ is not derivable, then $V_i \neq V$, where $X \in E_i$ and $t[X] = V_i$, $t[X] \neq V$, again showing that st_1 is a counterexample to the validity of $e: X \equiv V$.

Now consider an FD $X \rightarrow Y$ such that for no $X_1 \subseteq X$ is $X_1 \rightarrow Y \in \text{Drv}(e)$. Using the sets $\{E_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ defined above we define a function g which maps FDs on e to FDs on an n -ary relation R' . First, we write $g(X) = \{i\}$ if $X \in E_i$ and V_i was an arbitrary value; otherwise $g(X) = \emptyset$ (where V_i was assigned because $X \equiv V_i$ was derivable). Then for a set $Z = \{Z_1 \dots Z_n\}$ of domains, $g(Z) = g(Z_1) \cup \dots \cup g(Z_n)$, and finally, $g(Z \rightarrow A) = g(Z) \rightarrow g(A)$. We let s' be the schema consisting of R' and also every FD $g(Z \rightarrow A)$ where $R: Z \rightarrow A \in s$. First we note that $g(X) \rightarrow g(Y)$ is not derivable in s' , i.e., there is no $X' \subseteq g(X)$ such that $X' \rightarrow g(Y) \in \text{Drv}(R')$. ($X \rightarrow Y$ is the given non-derivable FD.) Since the reflexive and pseudotransitivity rules are complete (according to our interpretation which incorporates augmentation) for FDs on one relation (with no EQs) [Arms], there exists a state $R'(st_2)$ such that $g(X) \rightarrow g(Y)$ is false in $R'(st_2)$. We now use g to construct a counterexample state st_3 for $R: X \rightarrow Y$. To do this we define a function h , an inverse of g , which, from tuples of $R'(st_2)$, will yield tuples of $R(st_3)$. Namely, if $t' \in R'(st_2)$, then $h(t')$ is the tuple t such that $t[X] = V$ if $X \equiv V$ is derivable, and $t[X] = t'[i]$ when V_i was arbitrary and $X \in E_i$. Then we let $R(st_3) = h(R'(st_2))$. It is not hard to see that all constraints in s are true in $R(st_3)$ and that $X \rightarrow Y$ is false in $R(st_3)$.

We next assume that the expression e is a cross product of selections or other cross products. That is, e is of the form $R_1[X_1 \equiv V_1] \times \dots \times R_n[X_n \equiv V_n]$, where each X_i and V_i may be a list. Suppose that $Z \rightarrow A$ is such that $Z_1 \rightarrow A \notin \text{Drv}(e)$ for every $Z_1 \subseteq Z$. Let $Z_1 \subseteq Z$ be the domains of e appearing in the same selection term that A appears in. (Z_1 may be empty.) Let us also

assume that this term is first in e , i.e., that we can write e as $R[X_1 \equiv V_1] \times e_2$. Then for no $Z_2 \subset Z_1$ is $Z_2 \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(R[Z_1 \equiv V_1])$ for otherwise we would have $Z_2 \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e)$. By the induction hypothesis, there is a state st_1 such that $Z_1 \rightarrow A$ is false in $R[X_1 \equiv V_1](st_1)$. If $e_2(st_1)$ (the remainder of e) is nonempty, then $Z \rightarrow A$ will also be false in $e(st_1)$, for if t_1 and t_2 are tuples of $R[X_1 \equiv V_1](st_1)$ contradicting $Z_1 \rightarrow A$ and if t' is any tuple of $e_2(st_2)$, then $t_1 \times t'$ and $t_2 \times t'$ are tuples in $e(st_1)$ contradicting $Z \rightarrow A$. It remains to show that if $e_2(st_1) = \emptyset$, that we can modify the state to get $e_2(st_1)$ nonempty while retaining tuples in $R[X_1 \equiv V_1]$ contradicting $Z_1 \rightarrow A$.

First consider the subexpression r of e consisting of all the selections on the base relation R : $r = R[X_1 \equiv V_1] \times \dots \times R[X_m \equiv V_m]$. (The X s and V s have been renumbered and any selection term not in r is on a base relation other than R .) We will write this as $s_1 \times \dots \times s_m$. Before we proceed to modify st_1 so that r is nonempty, we prove a lemma. Note that every domain Y in r can be written $d_i + X$ where $1 \leq X \leq \text{deg}(R)$ and d_i (a "displacement") equals $(i-1)\text{deg}(R)$, where Y is a domain in the term s_i . Then we have:

- (i) if $d_i + X = d_j + Y \in \text{Drv}(r)$, $i \neq j$, X is different from Y , and no $V \in Q$ $d_i + X \equiv V$ or $d_j + Y \equiv V$ is derivable in r , then $d_i + X = d_j + X$ and $d_i + Y = d_j + Y$ are in $\text{Drv}(r)$, and $X = Y$ is in $\text{Drv}(R)$;
- (ii) if $d_i + X \equiv V \in \text{Drv}(r)$, then $\emptyset \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(s_i)$, and
- (iii) if $d_i + X = d_j + X \in \text{Drv}(r)$, then $\emptyset \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(s_i) \cap \text{Drv}(s_j)$.

This lemma describes the kind of EQs which can hold on a

cross product of selection terms, each term on the same base relation. A formal proof of the properties is given, but first we will give an intuitive discussion.

Consider a cross product $r = s_1 \times \dots \times s_n$, where each s_i has the form $R[X_i \equiv V_i]$, with X_i, V_i lists.

An EQ within a single term, e.g., $d_i + X = d_i + Y$ could be the result of the selections on that term: $d_i + X \equiv V$ and $d_i + Y \equiv V$ are in $\text{Drv}(s_i)$. If this is not the case, then the E must be the result of the EQ $X=Y$ which must be in $\text{Drv}(R)$. This is because the only linking from one term to another in r is through VEQs with the same value. The transitivity rule may have been used in the derivation of $d_i + X = d_i + Y$, but eventually we will arrive at the above result.

Consider an EQ $d_i + X = d_j + X$, an equality of corresponding domains in different terms. As above, this equality could be the result of VEQs $d_i + X \equiv V$ in $\text{Drv}(s_i)$ and $d_j + X \equiv V$ in $\text{Drv}(s_j)$. If this is not the case, it must (eventually) be the result of an FD $Z \rightarrow X$ and VEQs $d_i + Z \equiv V$ in $\text{Drv}(s_i)$ and $d_j + Z \equiv V$ in $\text{Drv}(s_j)$. By composing, we get $\emptyset \rightarrow d_i + X$ in $\text{Drv}(s_i) \sqcap \text{Drv}(s_j)$. That is, if an EQ is derived by equivalent FDs, the left-hand-sides of the FDs must be equal because of VEQs and this means that the domains

Consider an EQ $d_i + X = d_j + Y$ with $i \neq j$ and $X \neq Y$. Again, this EQ may be the immediate result of VEQs. If not, it will be the result of the previous two cases using transitivity. That is, $d_i + X = d_j + Y$ will be derivable in r , and $X = Y$ will be derivable in R . We can further derive $d_i + Y = d_j + Y$ in r .

Finally, consider a VEQ $d_i+X \equiv V$ in $\text{Drv}(r)$. If this VEQ is also in $\text{Drv}(s_i)$, then $\emptyset \rightarrow X$ is in $\text{Drv}(s_i)$. But d_i+X will be constant in s_i even if the VEQ is not derivable in s_i , since cross products do not filter out any tuples.

To prove (i), note that rule [2] of C1 (transitivity) is the only one which can generate the indicated EQ. So we use induction on the number of applications of rule [2].

There are only two possible pairs of EQs to which transitivity can be applied and which themselves are not the result of transitivity. One pair consists of $d_i+X=d_k+X$, which would be the result of rule [8], and $d_k+X=d_j+Y$, which would be the result of an EQ $X=Y$ derivable in s_i and s_j . From $X=Y$ we can get $d_i+Y=d_i+X$, which yields $d_i+Y=d_j+Y$ derivable in r , and also $d_j+Y=d_j+X$, which yields $d_i+X=d_j+X$ derivable in r . Now the EQ $X=Y$ must, in fact, be derivable in R , for the only other way to get an EQ in a selection on a base relation is to derive it from VEQs which we assumed impossible.

The other pair of EQs is like the one above with the roles of X and Y interchanged.

Now assume the hypotheses hold and also there are EQs $d_i+X=d_k+Z$ and $d_k+Z=d_j+Y$ derivable in r . First assume $X \neq Z \neq Y$. We cannot have any VEQs $d_k+Z \equiv V$ since this would yield $d_i+X \equiv V$ and $d_j+Y \equiv V$. By induction, we have $d_k+Z=d_j+Z$ and $d_i+Z=d_k+Z$ derivable in r , and $X=Z$ and $Y=Z$ derivable in R . We therefore have $X=Y$ derivable in R and $d_i+Z=d_j+Z$ derivable in r , and from this we get $d_i+X=d_j+X$ and $d_i+Y=d_j+Y$ derivable in r . If Z is X , then we have $d_i+X=d_k+X$ and $d_k+X=d_j+Y$ derivable in r . By induction on the second EQ, we have $d_k+X=d_j+X$ and $d_k+Y=d_j+Y$ derivable in r

and $X=Y$ derivable in R . From this we derive $d_i+X=d_j+X$ and $d_i+Y=d_j+Y$ in r . If Z is Y we proceed analogously.

To prove part (ii), first assume $X \equiv V \in \text{Drv}(s_i)$. Then, clearly, $\emptyset \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(s_i)$. If $d_i+X=d_j+Y$ and $d_j+Y \equiv V$ are in $\text{Drv}(r)$ and $i \neq j$ and $X \neq Y$, then by (i) $d_i+X=d_j+X \in \text{Drv}(r)$. By (iii), $\emptyset \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(s_i)$. If $i=j$ or X is Y , we also get $\emptyset \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(s_i)$.

To prove (iii), we have that if $d_i+X \equiv V$ and $d_j+X \equiv V$ are in $\text{Drv}(r)$, then $\emptyset \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(s_i) \cap \text{Drv}(s_j)$ by (ii). If $d_i+X=d_k+Y$ and $d_k+Y=d_j+X$ are in $\text{Drv}(r)$, and $X \neq Y$, then by (i), $d_i+X=d_k+X$ and $d_k+X=d_j+X$ are in $\text{Drv}(r)$, so by induction, $\emptyset \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(s_i)$ and $\emptyset \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(s_j)$. If the EQ is the result of rule [8], then there must be an FD $Z \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(R)$ such that $d_i+Z=d_j+Z$ is in $\text{Drv}(r)$. By induction, $\emptyset \rightarrow Z \in \text{Drv}(s_i) \cap \text{Drv}(s_j)$, and therefore $\emptyset \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(s_i) \cap \text{Drv}(s_j)$.

This proves the lemma.

We now will indicate how to modify st_1 . We may suppose that $R(st_1) = R[X_1 \equiv V_1](st_1) = \{t_1, t_2\}$. (If not, delete the extra tuples; they do not add anything.) First let u be a 1:1 function defined on values appearing in t_1 and t_2 such that its image is distinct from the values in t_1 and t_2 and from the values appearing in the selection terms of r . Let E_1, \dots, E_n be the equivalence classes of the domains of r under '='. Associate a value V_i with each E_i as follows: (i) $V_i = V$ if $X \equiv V \in \text{Drv}(r)$ for some $X \in E_i$; (ii) if there is some $X \in E_i$ such that $1 \leq X \leq \text{deg}(R)$ (if X is a domain of s_1), then $V_i = u(t_1[X])$; (iii) otherwise V_i is an arbitrary unique value. Define $R(st_2) = \{t_1', t_2'\}$ as follows: $t_1'[X] = V_k$ if $X \in E_k$ and V_k is assigned by a VEQ;

$t_1[X] = u(t_1[X])$, otherwise. Also, $t_2[X] = V_k$ if $X \in E_k$ and V_k is assigned by a VEQ; $t_2[X] = u(t_2[X])$, otherwise.

We first show that st_2 is a state, that t_1 and t_2 appear in s_1 , and that st_2 is still a counterexample state for $Z_1 \rightarrow A$:

If $X \equiv V$ is a component of $X_1 \equiv V_1$, then V_k is assigned by a VEQ, where $X \in E_k$ and $V_k = V$. Hence $t_1[X] = t_2[X] = V$. Thus $R(st_2)$ satisfies the VEQs of $R[X_1 \equiv V_1]$, and $R[X_1 \equiv V_1](st_2) = R(st_2)$.

For the other properties of $R(st_2)$, we will show that $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$ if and only if $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$. First, it is clear from the definition that $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$ implies $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$.

Now suppose $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$. If V_k is not assigned by a VEQ, where $X \in E_k$, then $t_1[X] = u(t_1[X])$ and $t_2[X] = u(t_2[X])$, and since u is 1:1, we get $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$.

Now suppose $t_1[X] = V_k = t_2[X]$, where $X \in E_k$ and V_k is assigned by a VEQ. This means that $X \equiv V_k$ is derivable in r . By part (ii) of the lemma, $\emptyset \rightarrow X$ is in $\text{Drv}(s_1)$. Since $t_1, t_2 \in R[X_1 \equiv V_1](st_1)$, we have $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$. This proves $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$ if and only if $t_1[X] = t_2[X]$. From this we can conclude that FDS and DEQs which are true (false) in $R(st_1)$ are true (false) in $R(st_2)$. Thus st_2 is a state of s , and $Z_1 \rightarrow A$ is false in $R[X_1 \equiv V_1](st_2)$.

The next step is to show that we can add tuples to $R(st_2)$ to get a nonempty state for every other selection in r .

Consider a selection term $s_i = R[X_i \equiv V_i]$ ($i=2, \dots, m$) in r of displacement d_i ; that is, the domains of the selection are $d_i+1, \dots, d_i+\text{deg}(R)$. Define a tuple t_i by $t_i[X] = V_k$ where $d_i+X \in$

E_k . By construction, if t_i is placed in $R(st_2)$, then t_i will appear in $R[X_i \equiv V_i]$. It is also easy to see that t_i will satisfy all EQs in schema s . We must show that when t_2, \dots, t_m so constructed, are added to $R(st_2)$, that no FDs are violated. First we show that there will be no FD violations among t_2, \dots, t_m . So suppose $R:W \rightarrow B$ is in s and $t_i[W] = t_j[W]$. Then for each component W_k of W , $t_i[W_k] = t_j[W_k]$. If one of the values, say V_w , was assigned by clause (i) or (iii) of the definition of $\{E_i\}$, then both $d_i + W_k$ and $d_j + W_k$ are in E_w since this V_w is distinct from all other values associated with E -sets. If one of the values was assigned by the second clause, then both were, and we have, for some U_1 and U_2 , $1 \leq U_1, U_2 \leq \text{deg}(R)$, $d_i + W_k = U_1$ and $d_j + W_k = U_2$ derivable. If U_1 is W_k , we have $d_i + W_k = W_k$ derivable in r ; if not, then part (i) of the lemma will give $d_i + W_k = W_k$ derivable in r . Similarly, $d_j + W_k = W_k$ is derivable in r . Hence $d_i + W_k = d_j + W_k$ is derivable in r . The component k was arbitrary, so we may write: $d_i + W = d_j + W$ is derivable in r . Now $d_i + W \rightarrow d_i + B$ and $d_j + W \rightarrow d_j + B$ are also derivable in r and have the same identifier. We therefore have $d_i + B = d_j + B \in \text{Drv}(r)$, and therefore $t_i[B] = t_j[B]$ since $d_i + B$ and $d_j + B$ are in the same E -set.

Now we will show that there will be no FD violations between t_1 or t_2' and any of the t_i , $i=2, \dots, m$. So suppose $R:W \rightarrow B$ is in s and $t'[W] = t_i[W]$ (where t' is t_1 or t_2'). For each component W_j of W , $t'[W_j] = t_i[W_j]$. First suppose V_k is assigned by a VEQ, or by the third clause, where $d_i + W_j \in E_k$. The values assigned to these E -sets are unique, so we also have $0 + W_j \in E_k$, i.e., $W_j = d_i + W_j$ is derivable in r . Next suppose V_k was assigned by the second clause: There is an $X \in E_k$ with $1 \leq X \leq \text{deg}(R)$. We

have $d_i + W_j = X$ derivable, but from the lemma, we also get $d_i + W_j = W_j$ derivable. Collectively, we have $W = d_i + W$ derivable in r . Since $W \rightarrow B$ and $d_i + W \rightarrow d_i + B$ have the same identifier, we get $B = d_i + B$ in $\text{Drv}(r)$. If these domains (B and $d_i + B$) are in an E-set E_k whose value is assigned by a VEQ, then $t'[B] = t_i[B] = V_k$. Otherwise, V_k is equal to $u(t_1[X])$, where $1 \leq X \leq \text{deg}(R)$ and $X \in E_k$. Since $X = B$ will be in $\text{Drv}(r)$, it is also in $\text{Drv}(R[X_1 \equiv V_1])$ and if t' is t_1 , then we know $t_i[B] = u(t_1[X]) = u(t_1[B]) = t_1^i[B]$. If t' is t_2 , then from $B = d_i + B$ we can conclude that $\emptyset \rightarrow B$ is in $\text{Drv}(R[X_1 \equiv V_1])$, and this also yields $t_i[B] = t_1^i[B] = t_2^i[B]$. Thus no FDs are violated, and we may define a state st_3 by $R(st_3) = R(st_2) \cup \{t_2, \dots, t_n\}$. This state will have the property that $r(st_3) \neq \emptyset$ and $Z_1 \rightarrow A$ is false in $R[X_1 \equiv V_1](st_3)$.

We still may have $e(st_3) = \emptyset$ because selections on other relations may be empty. However, by a process similar to the one above, we may add tuples to get a nonempty cross product.

The case for EQs which are not derivable in the cross product can be handled in an analogous fashion.

This completes the case for cross product.

Now suppose that e is a union $e_1 \cup e_2$ and that $Z_1 \rightarrow A \notin \text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)$ for every $Z_1 \subseteq Z$. In particular, we have $Z \rightarrow A \notin \text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)$. Suppose $Z \rightarrow A$ is not derivable in e_1 . By induction there is a state st_1 such that $Z \rightarrow A$ is false in $e_1(st_1)$. Then $Z \rightarrow A$ will also be false in $(e_1 \cup e_2)(st_1)$. If $Z \rightarrow A$ is not derivable in e_2 , we proceed in a similar manner. In the remaining case $\{id_{1i} : Z \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e_1), \{id_{2j} : Z \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e_2)\}$ but $\neg \text{Eqv}(id_{1i}, id_{2j})$ for some i, j . By Theorem 2, there is a state st

and a valuation x such that $id_{1i}(st;x) \neq id_{2j}(st;x)$, and by Theorem 3 there are tuples $t_1 \in e_1(st)$ and $t_2 \in e_2(st)$ such that $t_1[Z] = t_2[Z]$ but $t_1[A] \neq t_2[A]$. Thus we will have $t_1, t_2 \in (e_1 \cup e_2)(st)$, and these tuples will contradict the FD $Z \rightarrow A$.

If an EQ is not derivable in $e_1 \cup e_2$, it is not derivable in either e_1 or e_2 . We construct a counterexample state by induction on the appropriate component (e_1 or e_2), and this will also be a counterexample state for the union.

In the last case, e is a projection $e_1[X]$. If c is any constraint not derivable in e , then c_1 will not be derivable in e_1 , where c_1 is c with each domain Y replaced by $X[Y]$. By induction, we construct a counterexample state for c_1 in e_1 and this will also be a counterexample state for c in e . \square

The theorem demonstrating the properties of G needs the following lemma which says that moving operators around does not change the set of derived constraints.

Lemma. Let s be a schema, and let e, e_1 and e_2 be expressions over s . Then

- (i) $Drv(e[X=Y][Z \equiv V]) = Drv(e[Z \equiv V][X=Y])$
- (ii) $Drv((e_1 \times e_2)[X \equiv V]) = Drv(e_1[X \equiv V] \times e_2)$, if $X \leq \text{deg}(R)$
- (iii) $Drv((e_1 \times e_2)[X \equiv V]) = Drv(e_1 \times (e_2[X \equiv V]))$, if $X > \text{deg}(R)$
- (iv) $Drv((e_1 \cup e_2)[X]) = Drv(e_1[X] \cup e_2[X])$

Proof. (i) From the definitions we have

$$Drv(e[X=Y][Z \equiv V]) = Cl(Cl(Drv(e) \cup X=Y) \cup Z \equiv V) \text{ and}$$

$$\text{Drv}(e[Z \equiv V][X=Y]) = \text{Cl}(\text{Cl}(\text{Drv}(e) \cup Z \equiv V) \cup X=Y).$$

It is not hard to show that the inclusion $\text{Cl}(\text{Cl}(\text{Drv}(e) \cup X=Y) \cup Z \equiv V) \subseteq \text{Cl}(\text{Cl}((\text{Drv}(e) \cup Z \equiv V) \cup X=Y))$ is true and also that the reverse inclusion holds.

(ii) The definitions give us

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Drv}((e_1 \times e_2)[X \equiv V]) &= \text{Cl}(\text{Cl}(\text{Drv}(e_1) \cup \text{Drv}'(e_2)) \cup X \equiv V) \text{ and} \\ \text{Drv}(e_1[X \equiv V] \times e_2) &= \text{Cl}(\text{Cl}(\text{Drv}(e_1) \cup X \equiv V) \cup \text{Drv}'(e_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Again we can show equality by showing inclusion in both directions.

Part (iii) is analogous.

(iv) The formulas give us

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Drv}((e_1 \cup e_2)[X]) &= \{id_2: Z \rightarrow A : id_1: X[Z] \rightarrow X[A] \in \text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)\} \cup \\ &\quad \{Y=Z : X[Y]=X[Z] \in \text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)\} \cup \\ &\quad \{Y \equiv V : X[Y] \equiv V \in \text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)\}, \text{ where } id_1 \text{ and } id_2 \\ &\quad \text{are as in the definition, and} \\ \text{Drv}(e_1[X] \cup e_2[X]) &= \{x \in \text{Drv}(e_1[X]) \cap \text{Drv}(e_2[X]) : x \text{ is an EQ}\} \cup \\ &\quad \{id_1: Z \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e_1[X]) : \text{there is } id_2: Z \rightarrow A \\ &\quad \text{in } \text{Drv}(e_2[X]) \text{ with } \text{Rdc}(id_1) = \text{Rdc}(id_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

First we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\{Y=Z : X[Y]=X[Z] \in \text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)\} \cup \{Y \equiv V : X[Y] \equiv V \in \text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)\} \\ &= \\ &\quad \{x \in \text{Drv}(e_1[X]) \cap \text{Drv}(e_2[X]) : x \text{ is an EQ}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now an FD $id_1: X[Z] \rightarrow X[A]$ is in $\text{Drv}(e_1 \cup e_2)$ if and only if $id_1: X[Z] \rightarrow X[A] \in \text{Drv}(e_1)$ and there is $id_2: X[Z] \rightarrow X[A]$ in $\text{Drv}(e_2)$ with $\text{Rdc}(id_1) = \text{Rdc}(id_2)$. This is true if and only if $id_1: Z \rightarrow A$

$\in \text{Drv}(e_1[X])$ and $\text{id}_2': Z \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e_2[X])$, where id_1' (id_2') is obtained from id_1 (id_2) by adding an arc to each leaf node and to the root node. Now $\text{Rdc}(\text{id}_1') = \text{Rdc}(\text{id}_1) = \text{Rdc}(\text{id}_2) = \text{Rdc}(\text{id}_2')$, and so the condition is equivalent to $\text{id}_1': Z \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e_1[X] \cup e_2[X])$. This shows that the two sets of FDs are the same. \square

Theorem 11. Let s be a schema, and let e be an expression over s of syntax III. Then $\text{Drv}(G(e)) = \text{Drv}(e)$, and for every structure str , $G(e)(\text{str}) \subseteq e(\text{str})$.

Proof. We first note that for any expressions e_1, e_2, e_3 , if $e_1(\text{str}) \subseteq e_2(\text{str})$, then $e_1[X=V](\text{str}) \subseteq e_2[X=V](\text{str})$, $(e_1 \times e_3)(\text{str}) \subseteq (e_2 \times e_3)(\text{str})$, $(e_3 \times e_1)(\text{str}) \subseteq (e_3 \times e_2)(\text{str})$, $e_1[X=Y](\text{str}) \subseteq e_2[X=Y](\text{str})$, $(e_1 \cup e_3)(\text{str}) \subseteq (e_2 \cup e_3)(\text{str})$ and $e_1[X](\text{str}) \subseteq e_2[X](\text{str})$. In other words, the set-inclusion condition is preserved by all the relational algebra operators (except, of course, set difference).

Now suppose e has the form $r_1[X_1] \cup \dots \cup r_n[X_n]$, where each r_i is a restriction of a cross product. Let $r_i \in \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ which contains a restriction $X=Y$. As in the definition, r^* is r_i with $X=Y$ removed. We treat each of the three cases in the definition.

In the first case, since $X=V \in \text{Drv}(r^*)$, we have $X=Y \in \text{Drv}(r^*[Y=V])$. Therefore $\text{Drv}(r_i) \subseteq \text{Drv}(r^*[Y=V])$. On the other hand, since $X=V$ and $X=Y$ are in $\text{Drv}(r_i)$, we have $\text{Drv}(r^*[Y=V]) \subseteq \text{Drv}(r_i)$. Therefore $\text{Drv}(r^*[Y=V]) = \text{Drv}(r_i)$. This implies that $\text{Drv}(r_1[X_1] \cup \dots \cup r_i[X_i] \cup \dots \cup r_n[X_n]) = \text{Drv}(r_1[X_1] \cup \dots \cup r^*[Y=V][X_i] \cup \dots \cup r_n[X_n])$. Moving the selection

term $Y \equiv V$ inside to its base relation gives us, by the previous lemma $\text{Drv}(r_1[X_1] \cup \dots \cup r_i[X_i] \cup \dots \cup r_n[X_n])$, where r_i has one less restriction than r_i .

It is easy to see that $r^*[Y \equiv V](\text{str}) \subseteq r_i(\text{str})$ for all structures str . (In fact, $r^*[Y \equiv V] = r_i$.)

The second case is analogous to the first case.

In the third case, r_i is to be replaced by $r' = r^*[X \equiv V_1][Y \equiv V_1] \cup r^*[X \equiv V_2][Y \equiv V_2]$, where $V_1 \neq V_2$ are new values. The EQ $X=Y$ is derivable in both terms of this union, so $\text{Drv}(r_i) \subseteq \text{Drv}(r')$. Any VEQ $Z \equiv V$ in $\text{Drv}(r')$ must be derivable in both $r^*[X \equiv V_1][Y \equiv V_1]$ and $r^*[X \equiv V_2][Y \equiv V_2]$. This means that $V \neq V_1$ and $V \neq V_2$, and therefore $Z \equiv V$ is derivable in r^* . From this we conclude that $Z \equiv V \in \text{Drv}(r_i)$. Suppose an EQ $Z=W$ is derivable in both $r^*[X \equiv V_1][Y \equiv V_1]$ and $r^*[X \equiv V_2][Y \equiv V_2]$. Then it is either derivable in r^* , or it follows from $X \equiv V_1, Y \equiv V_1$ or $X \equiv V_2, Y \equiv V_2$ via the EQ $X=Y$. In both cases it is derivable in r_i .

Now suppose an FD $Z \rightarrow A$ is derivable in r' . Since it must have equivalent identifiers in both $r^*[X \equiv V_1][Y \equiv V_1]$ and in $r^*[X \equiv V_2][Y \equiv V_2]$, the identifiers must not have any nodes labelled with either V_1 or V_2 . This means no FDs $\emptyset \rightarrow X$ or $\emptyset \rightarrow Y$ whose identifiers would be ' V_1 ' $\rightarrow X$, ' V_2 ' $\rightarrow X$. However, the FDs $X \rightarrow Y$ and $Y \rightarrow X$, whose identifiers are themselves can be used, but if so, it is because the FD was derived from the EQ $X=Y$ (unless $X \rightarrow Y$ or $Y \rightarrow X \in \text{Drv}(r^*)$ which is still fine.) Thus $Z \rightarrow A$ will also be derivable in r_i . We have therefore shown that $\text{Drv}(r') \subseteq \text{Drv}(r_i)$. Let $r_i^1 = r^*[X \equiv V_1][Y \equiv V_2]$ and $r_i^2 = r^*[X \equiv V_2][Y \equiv V_1]$. Then by the previous lemma, we have $\text{Drv}(r_1[X_1] \cup \dots \cup r_i^1[X_i] \cup \dots \cup r_n[X_n]) =$

$\text{Drv}(r_1[X_1] \cup \dots \cup r_i^1[X_i] \cup r_i^2[X_i] \cup \dots \cup r_n[X_n])$. We also note that if $t \in r^*[X \equiv V_1][Y \equiv V_1](\text{str})$, then $t[X] = t[Y]$, and so $t \in r^*[X=Y](\text{str}) = r_i(\text{str})$. Similarly, we get $r^*[X \equiv V_2][Y \equiv V_2](\text{str}) \subseteq r_i(\text{str})$. Thus $r_i^1(\text{str}) \subseteq r_i(\text{str})$.

We have shown for every step in the construction of $G(e)$, that the Drv-set does not change, and that structures of the new expression are subsets of structures of the original expression e . Therefore $\text{Drv}(G(e)) = \text{Drv}(e)$, and for all structures str , $G(e)(\text{str}) \subseteq e(\text{str})$. \square

Theorem 12. Let s be a schema, and let e be an expression over s which is consistent and of syntax III. Then any valid EQ on e is a member of $\text{Drv}(e)$, and if $Z \rightarrow A$ is valid on e , then for some $Z_1 \subseteq Z$, $Z_1 \rightarrow A \in \text{Drv}(e)$.

Proof. Suppose e is consistent and $c \notin \text{Drv}(e)$. Since e is consistent, $G(e)$ is consistent. If c is an EQ not in $\text{Drv}(e) = \text{Drv}(G(e))$, or if it is an FD $Z \rightarrow A$ such that $Z_1 \rightarrow A \notin \text{Drv}(e) = \text{Drv}(G(e))$ for every $Z_1 \subseteq Z$, then by Theorem 10, there is a state st such that c is false in $G(e)(\text{st})$. Since $G(e)(\text{st}) \subseteq e(\text{st})$, c is also false in $e(\text{st})$. \square

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM	
1. REPORT NUMBER 1961	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. 9	3. REPORTING ORGANIZATION NAME <i>Technical</i>	4. TITLE (and Subtitle) CALCULATING CONSTRAINTS ON RELATIONAL EXPRESSIONS
7. AUTHOR(s) 10 A. Klug	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) 15 DAAG29-75-C-0024	5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Summary Report, Final Report	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin 610 Walnut Street Madison, Wisconsin 53706	10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 8. Computer Science	11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS See Item 18 below	12. DATE 11 May 79
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) 12 70	15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	13. NUMBER OF PAGES 66	15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited. 14 MRC-TSR-1961			
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)			
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES U. S. Army Research Office Computer Science Department National Research Council of Canada P.O. Box 12211 University of Wisconsin- Ottawa, Ontario Research Triangle Park Madison 11A OR6, Canada North Carolina 27709 Madison, WI 53706			
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Multiple Views, Relational Algebra Functional Dependencies, Completeness 221 200 <i>Gu</i>			
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) A desirable feature of a database management system is the ability to support many views of the database via several user models. In order to provide this support while allowing the user to believe that his/her view and data model are the only ones, the database system must have a number of facilities. One of the most important of these is a mechanism to tell when view constraints will be satisfied given that the underlying database constraints are satisfied so that the user always sees what is expected. <p style="text-align: right;">continued</p>			

Abstract - continued

This paper deals with a particular instance of this problem where the constraints are functional dependencies and the views are created through relational algebra expressions. The problem immediately reduces to the problem of calculating all valid functional dependencies (and other constraints) on a relational algebra expression over relations in the base schema. The problem is undecidable in general but we give a sound and complete algorithm when set difference is omitted from relational algebra.