IDEA GROUPPUBLISHING



701 E. Chocolate Avenue, Hershey PA 17033-1117, USA Tel: 717/533-8845; Fax 717/533-8661; URL-http://www.idea-group.com **ITB8005**

Chapter XIII CopySet Comparison Queries in SQL

Mohammad Dadashzadeh Wichita State University, USA

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important promises of the relational data model has been that it frees the decision maker, the manager, from the necessity of resorting to an intermediary, the programmer, in retrieving information from the organization's database in response to unanticipated needs. That promise is founded on the availability of very high-level relational query languages such as SQL. Unfortunately, the current specification of the SQL standard fails to support users adequately in formulating complex queries involving set comparison that tend to arise in on-line analytical processing (OLAP) situations. As pointed out by Rao et al. (1996): "SQL's syntax is too restricted to express quantified queries. While SQL allows subqueries to form sets, the relationships that can be expressed over sets are limited, and must be written in awkward and complicated ways." This chapter presents a systematic approach for teaching users how to formulate in SQL complex set comparison queries encountered in ad-hoc decision-making scenarios.

BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

Consider the following relational database about suppliers and parts. (The primary key of each relation is underlined.)

SUPPLIER(S#, Supplier_Name, Supplier_City) PART(P#, Part_Name, Part_Color) SHIPMENT(S#, P#) SUPPLY(S#, P#)

This chapter appears in the book, *Developing Quality Complex Database Systems: Practices, Techniques and Technologies* by Shirley Becker. Copyright © 2001, Idea Group Publishing.

The relation SHIPMENT records information on what parts are *currently* shipped by each supplier, while the relation SUPPLY indicates what parts can be supplied, *in the future*, by each supplier. An instance of the relations SHIPMENT and SUPPLY is depicted below.

			1. C	
CURRENT		FUTU	FUTURE	
SHIPMENT		SUPI	SUPPLY	
S 1	P1	S 1	URE PLY P1Group InC.	
S 1	P2	S10	P2	
S 1	P3	S1	P3	
S 1	P5	S1	P4	
	P5 OOVright	S1	Р5	
S2	P1	S2	P1	
S2	P2	S2	P2	
S2	P3			
S 3	P1	S 3	P2	
S4	P1	S4	P1	
S4	P2	S4	P2	
S 5	P5			
S6 P5				
	bt Idea	S6	P6	

Now, consider the following queries:

Q1: Which suppliers are shipping *at least one* red part?

- Q2: Which suppliers are shipping *no* red parts?
- Q3: Which suppliers are shipping *only* red parts?
- Q4: Which suppliers are shipping every red part?
- **Q5:** Which suppliers are shipping *exactly* the red parts?
- Q6: Which suppliers are shipping no part that they will supply in the future?
- **Q7:** Which suppliers will not continue to supply the same parts that they are currently shipping?

Group Inc.

Of the queries listed, Q2-Q7 are considered *set comparison queries* since their result sets (i.e., the desired supplier numbers) can only be determined by comparing two sets (e.g., the set of part numbers shipped by each supplier against the set of part numbers for red parts). In contrast, the result set for Q1 can be obtained by merely matching (i.e., joining) the part number from a SHIPMENT row with that of a red PART row as shown below:

Q1: Which suppliers are shipping at least one red part?

- SELECT DISTINCT S#
- FROM SHIPMENT, PART

WHERE (SHIPMENT.P# = PART.P#) AND (PART_COLOR = 'RED'); Despite their innocuous appearances, queries involving set comparison are very difficult to formulate in relational query languages (Blanning, 1993; Celko, 1997; 12 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart"

button on the publisher's webpage: <u>www.igi-</u> global.com/chapter/set-comparison-queries-sql/8281

Related Content

Vertical Database Design for Scalable Data Mining

William Perrizo, Qiang Ding, Masum Serazi, Taufik Abidinand Baoying Wang (2005). Encyclopedia of Database Technologies and Applications (pp. 736-739). www.irma-international.org/chapter/vertical-database-design-scalable-data/11232

Towards Autonomic Workload Management in DBMSs

Baoning Niu, Patrick Martinand Wendy Powley (2011). *Theoretical and Practical Advances in Information Systems Development: Emerging Trends and Approaches (pp. 154-173).*

www.irma-international.org/chapter/towards-autonomic-workload-management-dbmss/52956

Semi-Supervised Event Extraction Incorporated With Topic Event Frame

Gongqing Wu, Zhuochun Miao, Shengjie Hu, Yinghuan Wang, Zan Zhangand Xianyu Bao (2023). *Journal of Database Management (pp. 1-26).*

www.irma-international.org/article/semi-supervised-event-extraction-incorporated-with-topicevent-frame/318453

The Expert's Opinion

Mohammad Dadashzadeh (1992). *Journal of Database Administration (pp. 35-40).* www.irma-international.org/article/expert-opinion/51100

Conflicts, Compromises and Political Decisions: Methodological Challenges of Enterprise-Wide E-Business Architecture

Kari Smolanderand Matti Rossi (2008). Journal of Database Management (pp. 19-40).

www.irma-international.org/article/conflicts-compromises-political-decisions/3380