## Chapter 13

## Exercise 13.1

Complete the data mart projects illustrated in Figure 13.4 and Figure 13.5, identifying the attributes of fact and dimensions.

## Sol:

1) 


2)


## Exercise 13.2

Design the data marts illustrated in Figure 13.4 and Figure 13.5 identifying the hierarchies among the dimensions.

## Sol:

## SnowFlake schemas

1) 


2)


## Exercise 13.3

Refer to the data mart for the management of supermarkets, described in section 13.2.2. Design an interactive interface for the extraction of the data about classes of products sold in the various weeks of the year in stores located in large cities. Write the SQL query that corresponds to the proposed interface.

## Sol:

We assume that attribute size refers to the City of the supermarket.

| Product.Category | Time.WeekYear | Market.Size | Qty | Schema |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Food <br> Soap <br> Saucepan | $1 . .52$ | $0 \ldots 5000000$ |  | Option |
|  |  | $>10000$ |  | Condition |
| Product.Category | Time.WeekYear |  | sum (Qty) | View |

## SQL code:

```
select Product.Category, Time.WeekYear, sum(Qty)
from Sale, Product, Time, Market
where Sale.ProductCode=product.ProductCode
    and Sale.MarketCode=Market.MarketCode
    and Sale.TimeCode=Time.TimeCode
    and Market.Size > 10000
group by Time.WeekYear, Product, Category
order by Product.Category, Time.WeekYear
```


## Exercise 11.4

Describe the roll-up and drill-down operations relating to the result of the query posed in the preceding exercise.

## Sol:

The following table contains a possible result for the query in Exercise 13.3

| Product.Category | Time.WeekYear | sum(Qty) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Soap | 15 | 20 |
| Soap | 30 | 30 |
| Food | 2 | 50 |
| Food | 6 | 80 |
| Food | 20 | 70 |
| Saucepan | 8 | 10 |
| Saucepan | 20 | 5 |

A drill-down operation adds a dimension to the analysis. In this example the operation add "City". The new result of the query is:

| Product.Category | Time.WeekYear | Market.City | Sum (Qty) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Soap | 15 | London | 10 |
| Soap | 15 | Edinburgh | 10 |
| Soap | 30 | London | 20 |
| Soap | 30 | Edinburgh | 10 |
| Food | 2 | London | 30 |
| Food | 2 | Edinburgh | 20 |
| Food | 6 | London | 40 |
| Food | 6 | Edinburgh | 40 |
| Food | 20 | London | 70 |
| Saucepan | 8 | London | 5 |
| Saucepan | 8 | Edinburgh | 5 |
| Saucepan | 20 | London | 3 |
| Saucepan | 20 | Edinburgh | 2 |

A roll-up operation eliminates a dimension from the analysis: in this case the operation deletes the attribute WeekYear and re-aggregates the data:

| Product.Category | Market.City | sum(Qty) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Soap | London | 30 |
| Soap | Edinburgh | 20 |
| Food | London | 140 |
| Food | Edinburgh | 60 |
| Saucepan | London | 8 |
| Saucepan | Edinburgh | 7 |

## Exercise 13.5

Describe the use of the with cube clause and with roll up clause in conjunction with the query posed in Exercise 13.3

## Sol:

If the with cube clause is used in conjunction with a query, the result will contain all the possible aggregations of the dimensions of analysis:

```
select Product.Category, Time.WeekYear, sum(Qty)
from Sale, Product, Time, Market
where Sale.ProductCode=product.ProductCode
    and Sale.MarketCode=Market.MarketCode
    and Sale.TimeCode=Time.TimeCode
    and Market.Size > 10000
group by Time.WeekYear, Product, Category
with cube
```

The result is:

| Product.Category | Time.WeekYear | sum(Qty) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Soap | 15 | 20 |
| Soap | 30 | 30 |
| Soap | ALL | 50 |
| Food | 2 | 50 |
| Food | 6 | 80 |
| Food | 20 | 70 |
| Food | ALL | 200 |
| Saucepan | 8 | 10 |
| Saucepan | 20 | 5 |
| Saucepan | ALL | 15 |
| ALL | 2 | 50 |
| ALL | 6 | 80 |
| ALL | 8 | 10 |
| ALL | 15 | 20 |
| ALL | 20 | 75 |
| ALL | 30 | 30 |
| ALL | ALL | 265 |

The roll up clause causes a progressive aggregation of the dimensions: the aggregation is made from right to left, and so produces a smaller set of tuples than the data cube:

```
select Product.Category, Time.WeekYear, sum(Qty)
from Sale, Product, Time, Market
where Sale.ProductCode=product.ProductCode
    and Sale.MarketCode=Market.MarketCode
    and Sale.TimeCode=Time.TimeCode
    and Market.Size > 10000
group by Time.WeekYear, Product, Category
with roll up
```

| Product.Category | Time.WeekYear | sum(Qty) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Soap | 15 | 20 |
| Soap | 30 | 30 |
| Food | 2 | 50 |
| Food | 6 | 80 |
| Food | 20 | 70 |
| Saucepan | 8 | 10 |
| Saucepan | 20 | 5 |
| Soap | ALL | 50 |
| Food | ALL | 200 |
| Saucepan | ALL | 15 |
| ALL | ALL | 265 |

## Exerxcise 13.6

Indicate a selection of bitmap indexes, join indexes and materialized views for the data mart described in Section 13.2.2.

## Sol:

To indicate a set of indexes for a data warehouse it is necessary to know which are the most frequent operations applied to it.
The schema of the data warehouse is:

SALE(ProdCode, MarketCode, PromoCode, TimeCode, Qty, Revenue)<br>PRODUCT(ProdCode, Name, Category, SubCategory, Brand, Weight, Supplier)<br>MARKET(MarketCode, Name, City, Region, Zone, Size, Layout)<br>PROMOTION (PromoCode, Name, Type, Percentage, FlagCoupon, StartDate, EndDate, Cost, Agency)<br>TIME (TimeCode, DayWeek, DayMonth, DayYear, WeekMonth, WeekYear, MonthYear, Season, PreholidayFlag, HolidayFlag)

Let us suppose that the most frequent queries are:

1) Select all the sales with a specified product code and market code.
2) Select all the promotions with a specified start date and end date.
3) Select all the sales of a specified category of product.
4) Select all the sales with a specified promotion code and where category="Food".
5) Select all the sales in a specified Market where category="Food".

The first query suggests the introduction of two bitmap indexes on table SALE for the attributes ProductCode and MarketCode, because the query has a conjunction in its condition of selection.
Also, the second query suggests two bitmap indexes on table TIME, on the attributes StartDate and EndDate.

The third query requires a join between tables SALE and PRODUCT on the attribute ProdCode. A join index on this attribute makes the query more efficient.

The last two queries suggest the introduction of a view materialization for the query

```
select Sale.*, Product.Category
from Sale join Product on Sale.ProdCode=Product.prodCode
```

This query can be calculated only once and then can be used by both the queries 4 and 5 each time they need it.

This analysis does not consider the actual frequency of the queries, the frequency of update of the data and the time necessary to calculate the view. A more accurate analysis could show that the introduction of the materialized view is not always useful.

## Exercise 13.7

Design a data mart for the management of university exams. Use as facts the result of the exams taken by the students. Use as dimension the following:

1) time;
2) the location of the exam (supposing the faculty to be organized over more than one site);
3) the lecture involved;
4) the characteristics of the student (for example, the data concerning pre-university school records, grades achieved in the university admission exam, and chosen degree course).

Create both star schema and snowflake schema, and give their translation in relational form. Then express some interface for analysis simulating the execution of the roll up and drill down instructions. Finally, indicate a choice of bitmap indexes, join indexes and materialized views.

Sol:

## Star Schema



## Relational Form

EXAM (TimeCode, LocationCode, Student, LectureCode, Course, Degree)
TIME(TimeCode, Day, Month, Year, WeekMonth, WeekYear, DayMonth)
LOCATION( LocationCode,LectureHall, Department, Faculty, Address, City) STUDENT (Number, Name, Address, DegreeCourse, Admission, PreUniversitySchool, SchoolType)


## Relational Form

> EXAM (DayMonth,MonthYear, YearNumber, LocationCode, Student, LectureCode, Course, Degree)
> DAY(DayMonth,MontYear,YearNumber)
> MONTH(MonthYear, YearNumber)
> YEAR(YearNumber)
> LECTURE (Code, Title, Author, Price, DateOfPublication)
> AUTHOR (Name, Age)
> STUDENT (Number, Name, Address, DegreeCourse, Admission)
> SCHOOL (Name, SchoolType)
> LECTUREHALL(LocationCode, Size, Department)
> DEPARTMENT(Name, Faculty, Address)
> FACULTY(Name, City)

## Interface for analysis:

| Lecture.Author | Location.Faculty | * | Schema |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| [string] | Engineering <br> Math <br> Physics |  | Option |
| Smith, Brown, <br> Green | Engineering, <br> Math |  | Condition |
|  | Location.Faculty | count $\left(^{*}\right)$ | View |

This interface selects the number of exams taken by students in the Faculty of Engineering and Math, who read books of Smith, Brown and Green to prepare the exams.

Result of the query:

| Lecture.Author | Location.Faculty | count(*) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Smith | Engineering | 270 |
| Brown | Engineering | 264 |
| Brown | Math | 250 |
| Green | Math | 280 |

Drill down on Time.MonthYear attribute:

| Lecture.Author | Location.Faculty | Time.MonthYear | $\boldsymbol{c o u n t}{ }^{*}$ *) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Smith | Engineering | 2 | 70 |
| Smith | Engineering | 6 | 100 |
| Smith | Engineering | 9 | 100 |
| Brown | Engineering | 2 | 264 |
| Brown | Math | 3 | 160 |
| Brown | Math | 7 | 90 |
| Green | Math | 1 | 150 |
| Green | Math | 7 | 130 |

Roll up on Lecture.Author

| Location.Faculty | Time.MonthYear | count ${ }^{*}$ ) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Engineering | 2 | 334 |
| Engineering | 6 | 100 |
| Engineering | 9 | 100 |
| Math | 1 | 150 |
| Math | 3 | 160 |
| Math | 7 | 220 |

These queries suggest the introduction of bitmap indexes on Location.Faculty and Lecture.Author. To make the joins more efficient it is possible to introduce join indexes (on Location.Code, Lecture.Code and Time.TimeCode) or materialized views.
The choice depends on the dimension of the tables, the number of different values of the attributes and the update frequency of the tables
Considering that in table Exam the tuples are often added but rarely updated or deleted, the choice of materialized views may be the best.

## Exercise 13.8

Design one or more data marts for railway management: use as facts the total number of daily passengers for each tariff on each train and on each section of the network. As dimensions, use the tariffs, the geographical position of the cities on the network, the composition of the train, the network maintenance and the daily delays.
Create one or more star schemas and give their translation in relational form.

## Sol:

## Star Schema:



## Relational Schema

PASSENGER(Tariff, Maintenance, Delay, Section, Vagon, Train, Number)<br>TARIFF (Code, Price, StartDate)<br>MAINTENANCE(Code, LastDate, Cost)<br>DELAY(TimeCode, Day, Month, Year, DelayMinutes)<br>SECTION(City, Region, Length)<br>VAGON( Number, Train, Class, DepartureTime, ArrivalTime)

## Exercise 13.9

Consider the database in Figure 13.19. Extract the association rules with support and confidence higher or equal to 20 percent. Then indicate which rules are extracted if a support higher than 50 percent is requested.

| Transaction | Date | Goods | Qty | Price |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $17 / 12 / 98$ | ski-pants | 1 | 140 |
| 1 | $17 / 12 / 98$ | boots | 1 | 180 |
| 2 | $18 / 12 / 98$ | ski-pole | 1 | 20 |
| 2 | $18 / 12 / 98$ | T-shirt | 1 | 25 |
| 2 | $18 / 12 / 98$ | jacket | 1 | 200 |
| 2 | $18 / 12 / 98$ | boots | 1 | 70 |
| 3 | $18 / 12 / 98$ | jacket | 1 | 200 |
| 4 | $19 / 12 / 98$ | jacket | 1 | 200 |
| 4 | $19 / 12 / 98$ | T-shirt | 3 | 25 |
| 5 | $20 / 12 / 98$ | T-shirt | 1 | 25 |
| 5 | $20 / 12 / 98$ | jacket | 1 | 200 |
| 5 | $20 / 12 / 98$ | tie | 1 | 25 |

Figure 13.19

## Sol:

| Premise | Consequence | Support | Confidence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ski-pant | boots | 0.2 | 1 |
| boots | ski-pants | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| T-shirt | jacket | 0.6 | 1 |
| jacket | T-shirt | 0.6 | 0.75 |
| T-shirt | ski-pole | 0.2 | 0.33 |
| ski-pole | T-shirt | 0.2 | 1 |
| T-shirt | boots | 0.2 | 0.33 |
| boots | T-shirt | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| jacket | boots | 0.2 | 0.25 |
| boots | jacket | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| jacket | tie | 0.2 | 0.25 |
| tie | jacket | 0.2 | 1 |
| T-shirt | tie | 0.2 | 0.33 |
| tie | T-shirt | 0.2 | 1 |
| \{ski-pole, T-shirt \} | \{jacket, boots \} | 0.2 | 1 |
| \{jacket, boots \} | \{ski-pole, T-shirt \} | 0.2 | 1 |
| \{ski-pole, jacket\} | \{T-shirt, boots\} | 0.2 | 1 |
| \{T-shirt, boots\} | \{ski-pole, jacket\} | 0.2 | 1 |
| \{ski-pole, boots\} | \{T-shirt,jacket\} | 0.2 | 1 |
| \{T-shirt,jacket \} | \{ski-pole, boots\} | 0.2 | 0.33 |
| \{boots,ski-pole, T-shirt \} | jacket | 0.2 | 1 |
| jacket | \{boots,ski-pole, T-shirt \} | 0.2 | 0.25 |
| \{ski-pole, T-shirt,jacket \} | boots | 0.2 | 1 |
| boots | \{ski-pole, T-shirt,jacket\} | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| \{ski-pole,jacket,boots\} | T-shirt | 0.2 | 1 |
| T-shirt | \{ski-pole,jacket,boots \} | 0.2 | 0.33 |


| $\{$ jacket,boots,T-shirt $\}$ | ski-pole | 0.2 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ski-pole | \{jacket,boots,T-shirt $\}$ | 0.2 | 1 |
| $\{$ T-shirt,jacket $\}$ | tie | 0.2 | 0.33 |
| tie | \{T-shirt,jacket $\}$ | 0.2 | 1 |
| \{T-shirt,tie $\}$ | jacket | 0.2 | 1 |
| jacket | \{T-shirt,tie $\}$ | 0.2 | 0.25 |
| $\{$ jacket,tie $\}$ | T-shirt | 0.2 | 1 |
| T-shirt | \{jacket,tie $\}$ | 0.2 | 0.33 |

If a support higher than 50 percent is requested, the only rule is:

- T-shirt -> jacket


## Exercise 13.10

Discretize the prices of the database in Exercise 13.9 into three values (low, average and high). Transform the data so that for each transaction a single tuple indicates the presence of at least one sale for each class. Then construct the association rules that indicates the simultaneous presence in the same transaction of sales belonging to different price classes.
Finally, interpret the results.

## Sol:

Discretization of prices:
low: $\quad$ price $\leq 25$
average: $\quad 25<$ prize $\leq 200$
high prize $\geq 200$

| Transaction | Date | Qty | Class |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $17 / 12 / 98$ | 2 | Average |
| 2 | $18 / 12 / 98$ | 1 | Average |
| 2 | $18 / 12 / 98$ | 2 | Low |
| 2 | $18 / 12 / 98$ | 1 | High |
| 3 | $18 / 12 / 98$ | 1 | High |
| 4 | $19 / 12 / 98$ | 1 | High |
| 4 | $19 / 12 / 98$ | 3 | Low |
| 5 | $20 / 12 / 98$ | 2 | Low |
| 5 | $20 / 12 / 98$ | 1 | High |

Association rules

| Premise | Consequence | Support | Confidence |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average | High | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| High | Average | 0.4 | 0.25 |
| Average | Low | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| Low | Average | 0.2 | 0.33 |
| High | Low | 0.6 | 0.75 |
| Low | High | 0.6 | 1 |
| \{Low, Average \} | High | 0.2 | 1 |
| High | \{Low, Average \} | 0.2 | 0.25 |
| \{High, Low $\}$ | Average | 0.2 | 0.33 |
| Average | \{High, Low $\}$ | 0.2 | 1 |
| \{High, Average $\}$ | Low | 0.2 | 1 |
| Low | \{High, Average $\}$ | 0.2 | 0.33 |

These results show that the most important rules are:

- Low -> High
- High -> Low

The biggest quantity of sales refers to the low class.
It means that high and low class articles are often bought together, while average class articles are not very pleasant for buyers.
These results may be useful in locating the articles in the various sectors of a supermarket.

## Exercise 13.11

Describe a database for car sales with the description of the automobiles (sport cars, saloons, estate, etc), the cost and the cylinder capacity of the automobiles (discretized in classes), and the age and salary of the buyers (also discretized into classes). Then form hypotheses on the structure of a classifier showing the propensity of the purchase of cars by different categories of persons.

## Sol:

The database is composed of the following tables:

CAR (Number, Model, Color, Optional, Cost)<br>MODEL(Code, Name, CylinderCap, MaxSpeed, Category) CLIENT(Name, Age, Salary)

Example of an instance of database:
CAR

| Number | Model | Color | Options | Cost |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 2478 | red | air conditioned | High |
| 2 | 2478 | black |  | High |
| 3 | 2631 | white | radio | Average |
| 4 | 4932 | red |  | Low |

MODEL

| Model | Name | Cylinder | Category |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2478 | Ferrari | $3000-4000$ | SportCar |
| 2631 | BMW | $2000-3000$ | StationWagon |
| 4932 | Toyota | $1000-2000$ | Runabout |

## CLIENT

| Name | Age | Salary |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Green | $20-25$ | Low |
| Brown | $25-30$ | High |
| Smith | $30-40$ | Average |
| Thomson | $40-50$ | Average |

## Classifier:

Propensity to purchase a car.


