Uniqueness of Update Strategies for Database Views

Stephen J. Hegner
Department of Computing Science
Umeå University
Sweden

The Context of this Work



- To each schema $\mathbf{D}$ is associated a set $\mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D})$ of *legal states* or *legal databases*.
- The database mapping $\gamma : \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D}) \to \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V})$ which defines the view is surjective.
- This framework covers virtually all notions of view.
- Exception: Views not defined by functional mappings; *e.g.*, definition via *paraconsistency*.

Translators for View Update



- An *update strategy* is a partial function:

  $\rho : \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D}) \times \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V}) \to \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D})$

  $\rho : \text{Base States} \times \text{View States} \to \text{Base States}$

  $(\text{Current Base State}, \text{New View State}) \mapsto \text{New Base State}.$

- Not all view updates are allowed; thus ρ is a partial function, in general.

Question: What is an appropriate translation function?

Answer: It depends upon both:

- the nature of the view function γ, and
- the use to which the view will be placed.

Extreme Cases of the View Update Problem

Example base schema and instance:

Name → Dept

Rel P:

Name	Dept	Proj
Smith	1	A
Jones	2	A
Jones	2	B

Proj → Budget

Rel Q:

Proj	Budget
A	100
C	300
D	300

Example views:

View Γ_a: All of Q

Proj → Budget

Proj	Budget
A	100
C	300
D	300

- Any update which respects the FD is allowed.
- Natural translation of view updates keeps relation P constant in all reflections of view updates.

View Γ_b: $\pi_{\text{Budget}}(\text{Q})$

Budget
100
300

- No view updates possible under any reasonable translation strategy.

Criteria for Determining Admissibility of Update Translations

In less extreme cases, there are two types of criteria which may be applied to assess translatability of view updates.

- *Uniqueness criteria:*
  - A view update is supported if it has only one “reasonable” reflection to an update of the base schema.
  - No *ad hoc* changes to the base schema are permitted in the translation.
  - Most work on the support of view updates has focused upon this type of criterion.
- *Interface criteria:*
  - These criteria focus upon how the view appears to its users. Important examples include the following:
    - The translation of a view update to an update of the base schema must be completely “understandable” within the context of the view itself.
    - Changes to the base schema which are not visible within the view schema are discouraged.
  - Relatively little work on the support of view updates has focused upon this type of criterion.

Example 1 — Uniqueness vs. Interface Criteria

Base schema and instance:

Rel P:

Name	Dept	Proj
Smith	1	A
Jones	2	A
Jones	2	B

Constraints:
Name $\rightarrow$ Dept
No nulls allowed.

View and instance:

$\mathsf{R} = \Pi_{(\mathsf{Name},\mathsf{Proj})}(\mathsf{P})$:

Name	Proj
Smith	A
Jones	A
Jones	B

Constraints:
No FD's
No nulls allowed.

Proposed view update: Delete (Smith, A) from R.

- This update would be allowed under most uniqueness criteria.
  - The unique "reasonable" base update is:
    Delete $(\text{Smith}, 1, A)$ from P.
- This view update might be disallowed under certain interface criteria.
  - The update involves a *hidden trigger*. The fact that Dept $= 1$ for Smith is removed from the base schema, but this deletion is not visible within the view.
  - The update is *irreversible* without knowledge of the state history of the base schema. Re-insertion of (Smith, A) into the view cannot magically re-create the fact that Smith was in Department 1.

Example 2 — Uniqueness vs. Interface Criteria

Base schema and instance:

Rel P:

Name	Dept	Proj
Smith	1	A
Jones	2	A
Jones	2	B
Wilson	1	Null

Constraints:
Name $\to$ Dept
Nulls allowed for Proj.

View and instance:

$\mathsf{R} = \Pi_{(\mathsf{Name},\widetilde{\mathsf{Proj}})}(\mathsf{P})$:
$\widetilde{\mathsf{Proj}}$ = Proj
with nulls
disallowed

Name	Proj
Smith	A
Jones	A
Jones	B

Constraints:
No FD's
No nulls allowed.

Proposed view update: Delete (Smith, A) from R.

- This view update is realizable by the base update:
  $$\text{Modify } (\text{Smith}, 1, A) \mapsto (\text{Smith}, 1, \mathsf{Null}) \ .$$
- The hidden trigger and irreversibility problems are not present in this modified view.
- Unfortunately, this view poses other update problems with respect to interface criteria: a *hidden dynamic constraint*.

Example 2a — Uniqueness vs. Interface Criteria

Base schema and instance:

Rel P:

Name	Dept	Proj
Smith	1	Null
Jones	2	A
Jones	2	B
Wilson	1	Null

Constraints:
$\text{Name} \rightarrow \text{Dept}$
Nulls allowed for Proj.

View and instance:

$\mathsf{R} = \Pi_{(\mathsf{Name},\widetilde{\mathsf{Proj}})}(\mathsf{P})$:
$\widetilde{\mathsf{Proj}} = \mathsf{Proj}$ with nulls disallowed

Name	Proj
Jones	A
Jones	B

Constraints:
No FD's
No nulls allowed.

Proposed view updates: Insert (Smith, A) into R
Insert (Young, A) into R

- The first is realizable by the base update:

$$\text{Modify } (\text{Smith}, 1, \mathsf{Null}) \mapsto (\text{Smith}, 1, A)\ .$$

- The second is not realizable, even under uniqueness conditions, because no department information is available for Young.
- Note that it is not possible to determine, from the view state alone, whether or not a proposed update is admissible. Further information from the base schema state must be known. This view contains a *hidden dynamic constraint*

Open vs. Closed Views

Open:



- The user has access to both the view and the base schema.
- The view is provided as a convenience.
- Uniqueness criteria suffice for update translation.

Closed:



- The user has access only to the view.
- The user has no direct knowledge of the base schema.
- The view must be self contained in terms of knowledge needed to effect updates.
- The view should preferably look “just” like a complete base schema.
- Interface criteria for update translations are extremely important.

Major Goal of this Work

- ➢ The overall goal is to develop a systematic theory of update support for *closed* database views.
  - This implies in particular that careful attention be paid to interface criteria.
- ➢ The strategy is to build upon the seminal *constant-complement* approach of Bancilhon and Spyratos.
- ➢ Major enhancements developed here:
  - Uniqueness of translations
  - Meet-based characterization of admissible updates

Closed Update Families

Recall: $\mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V})$ denotes the set of *states* or *legal databases* of the schema $\mathbf{V}$.

- A *closed update family* for $\mathbf{V}$ is an equivalence relation U on $\mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V})$.
- $(M_1, M_2) \in U$ means that the update $M_1 \longrightarrow M_2$ is admissible on $\mathbf{V}$.
- Interpretation of equivalence relation properties:
  - ➪ *Reflexivity* implies that the identity update is always allowed.
  - ➪ *Symmetry* implies that every update is reversible.
  - ➪ *Transitivity* implies that updates may be composed.

Fundamental modelling assumption: The set of admissible updates on a view forms a closed update family.

Closed Update Strategies

- Recall that an *update strategy* for the view $\Gamma = (\mathbf{V}, \gamma)$ with respect to the base schema $\mathbf{D}$ is a partial function:

  $\rho : \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D}) \times \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V}) \rightarrow \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D})$

  ρ : Base States $\times$ View States $\rightarrow$ Base States

  (Current Base State, New View State) $\mapsto$ New Base State.

- Let T $=$ a closed update family for the view $\mathbf{V}$.

  U $=$ a closed update family for the base schema $\mathbf{D}$.

- In a closed setting, the following conditions are also imposed to yield a *closed update strategy* for T with respect to U.

(upt:1) [Only view updates from T are embodied in ρ.]
$\rho(M, N)\downarrow$ iff $(\gamma(M), N) \in T$.

(upt:2) [Only base schema updates from U are embodied in ρ.]
If $\rho(M, N)\downarrow$, then $(M, \rho(M, N)) \in U$ and $\gamma(\rho(M, N)) = N$.

(upt:3) [Identity updates are reflected as identities.]
For every $M \in \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D})$, $\rho(M, \gamma(M)) = M$.

(upt:4) [Every view update is globally reversible.]
If $\rho(M, N)\downarrow$, then $\rho(\rho(M, N), \gamma(M)) = M$.

(upt:5) [View update reflection is transitive.]
If $\rho(M, N_1)\downarrow$ and $\rho(\rho(M, N_1), N_2)\downarrow$, then $\rho(M, N_2) = \rho(\rho(M, N_1), N_2)$.

Complement-Based Update Strategies

- Context:

$$\begin{array}{rl} \mathbf{D}: & \text{base schema} \\ \Gamma_1 = (\mathbf{V}_1,\ \gamma_1 : \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{V}_1): & \text{a view of } \mathbf{D} \\ \Gamma_2 = (\mathbf{V}_2,\ \gamma_2 : \mathbf{D} \to \mathbf{V}_2): & \text{a view of } \mathbf{D} \end{array}$$

- The view Γ_2 is a *(subdirect) complement* of Γ_1 if the state of $\mathbf{D}$ may be recovered from the combined states of $\mathbf{V}_1$ and $\mathbf{V}_2$. Formally,

$$\begin{array}{c} \gamma_1 \times \gamma_2 : \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D}) \to \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V}_1) \times \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V}_2) \\ M \mapsto (\gamma_1(M), \gamma_2(M)) \end{array}$$

  must be injective.

Observation [Bancilhon & Spyratos 81]: Every subdirect complement Γ_2 of Γ_1 defines an update strategy on Γ_1 as follows:

$$\mathsf{UpdStr}\langle \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \rangle (M_1, N_2) =$$

$$\begin{cases} (\gamma_1 \times \gamma_2)^{-1}(N_2, \gamma_2(M_1)) & \text{if } (N_2, \gamma_2(M_1)) \in (\gamma_1 \times \gamma_2)(\mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D})) \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{D} & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{D} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{V}_1 \times \mathbf{V}_2 & \rightarrow & \mathbf{V}_1 \times \mathbf{V}_2 \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} M_1 & \longrightarrow & \mathsf{UpdStr}\langle \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \rangle (M_1, N_2) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \gamma_1(M_1) \times \gamma_2(M_1) & \longrightarrow & N_2 \times \gamma_2(M_1) \end{array}$$

- This is called the update strategy defined by *constant complement* Γ_2.

Equivalence of Strategies

Theorem [Bancilhon & Spyratos 81]: Every closed update strategy is defined by a constant complement update strategy. □

Fact: There exist subdirect complements which do not define closed update families. □

- To understand the problem, consider the following visualization, in which $\Gamma_1 = (\mathbf{V}_1, \gamma_1)$ is to be updated with constant complement $\Gamma_2 = (\mathbf{V}_2, \gamma_2)$.



- Intuitively, there is an "overlap" of the two views, induced by the mappings γ_1 and γ_2.
- When updating Γ_1, the part of the state of $\mathbf{V}_1$ which overlaps $\mathbf{V}_2$ must be held constant, while the rest may be modified at will.
- Formalization of this notion is the key to identifying just those complements which define closed update families.

The Congruence of a View

- The *congruence* $\mathsf{Congr}(\Gamma)$ of a view $\Gamma = (\mathbf{V}, \gamma)$ of $\mathbf{D}$ is the equivalence relation defined by
$$(M_1, M_2) \in \mathsf{Congr}(\Gamma) \text{ iff } \gamma(M_1) = \gamma(M_2).$$

- In a set-based context without additional structure, every view is defined, up to isomorphism, by its congruence.

- Thus, there is a natural correspondence:

Equivalence relations on states of the base schema	$\longleftrightarrow$	Isomorphism classes of views of the base schema

- Note that a closed update family U on $\mathbf{D}$ defines a view of $\mathbf{D}$, since it is an equivalence relation.

- Given a closed update strategy ρ for $\Gamma = (\mathbf{V}, \gamma)$,

$$\{(M_1, M_2) \in \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D}) \times \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D}) \mid (\exists N \in \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V}))(\rho(M_1, N) = N_2)\}$$

  is the congruence of a view complementary to Γ which yields ρ with constant-complement update.

Commuting Congruences and Meet Complements

- A pair $\{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\}$ of views of $\mathbf{D}$ is called a *fully commuting pair* if $\mathsf{Congr}(\Gamma_1) \circ \mathsf{Congr}(\Gamma_2) = \mathsf{Congr}(\Gamma_2) \circ \mathsf{Congr}(\Gamma_1)$.

- In this case, $\mathsf{Congr}(\Gamma_1) \circ \mathsf{Congr}(\Gamma_2)$ is an equivalence relation.

- If $\{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\}$ is a fully commuting pair, the view whose congruence is $\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2$ is called the *meet* of $\Gamma_1 \circ \Gamma_2$, and is denoted $\Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2 = (\mathbf{V}_1 \; {}_{\gamma_1}\!\wedge_{\gamma_2} \mathbf{V}_2, \gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_2)$.

- In this case, $\Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$ may also be regarded as a view:
$$\Lambda(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = (\mathbf{V}_2, \lambda\langle\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\rangle) \text{ of } \Gamma_1.$$



- $\Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$ is effectively a glb of Γ_1 and Γ_2.

Meet Complements and Closed Update Strategies

Theorem [Hegner ICDT90, FoIKS02]: The update strategy $\mathsf{UpdStr}\langle\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\rangle$ is closed iff $\{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\}$ forms a fully commuting pair. $\square$

- The view update family on Γ_1 defined by the meet complementary pair $\{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\}$ is just $\mathsf{Congr}(\Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2)$.
  - In other words, the admissible updates on Γ_1 are under constant complement Γ_2 are precisely those which keep the meet $\Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$ constant.

Bottom Line: For a given view Γ, there is a natural bijective correspondence:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \text{Closed update strategies} & \longleftrightarrow & \text{Meet complements} \\ \rho & \longmapsto & \tilde{\Gamma}^{\rho} \\ \mathsf{UpdStr}\langle\Gamma, \Gamma'\rangle & \longleftarrow\!\shortmid & \Gamma' \end{array}$$

Meet in the Relational Context

- Under reasonable circumstances, the meet of two projections in the relational context is the projection on the intersection of the view attributes.
- Let:
  - $R[\mathbf{U}]$ = relation scheme on attribute set $\mathbf{U}$.
  - $\mathcal{D}$ = set of full dependencies.
  - $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}$ = subsets of $\mathbf{U}$.
- Suppose further that the decomposition is lossless and dependency preserving; *i.e.*,
  - $\bowtie [\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}] \in \mathcal{D}^+$.
  - $(\pi_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{D}) \cup \pi_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathcal{D}))^+ = \mathcal{D}^+$.
- Then $(R[\mathbf{X}], \pi_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathcal{D})) \wedge (R[\mathbf{Y}], \pi_{\mathbf{Y}}(\mathcal{D})) = (R[\mathbf{X} \cap \mathbf{Y}], \pi_{\mathbf{X}\cap\mathbf{Y}}(\mathcal{D}))$.



Update in the Relational Context

Example base schema and instance:

$(E[\mathsf{ABC}], \{\mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{C}\})$:

A	B	C
a_0	b_0	c_0
a_1	b_1	c_1
a_2	b_1	c_1

View to be updated:

View $\Pi_{\mathsf{AB}} = (E[\mathsf{AB}], \emptyset)$

A	B
a_0	b_0
a_1	b_1
a_2	b_1

Complementary view:

View $\Pi_{\mathsf{BC}} = (E[\mathsf{BC}], \{\mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{C}\})$

B	C
b_0	c_0
b_1	c_1

- The meet of these two views is $\Pi_{\mathsf{B}} = (E[\mathsf{B}], \emptyset)$.
- The updates which are allowed to $E[\mathsf{AB}]$ under constant complement Π_{BC} are precisely those which hold the meet Π_{B} fixed.

The Uniqueness Question

- Generally speaking, distinct complements give rise to distinct update strategies under constant-complement translation.

- In the general sets-and-mappings framework, complements are never unique, except in degenerate cases.

- This is true even for complements with the same meet.

Question: How does one choose the ”right” complement to support update translation on a view?

Answer: Usually, this is done on æsthetic grounds, by selecting a most natural complement.

Observation: In many cases, there is an obvious ”natural complement” which appears to be the only one which makes sense.

Goal: Develop a formal *theory* which identifies this natural complement as the only reasonable one.

Alternate Update in the Relational Context

Base schema:

$(E[\mathsf{ABC}], \{\mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{C}\})$

A	B	C
a_0	b_0	c_0
a_1	b_1	c_1
a_2	b_1	c_1

View to be updated:

View $\Pi_{\mathsf{AB}} = (E[\mathsf{AB}], \emptyset)$

A	B
a_0	b_0
a_1	b_1
a_2	b_1

- For any $b \in \mathsf{Dom}(\mathsf{B})$, $\#_{\mathsf{A}}(b)$ = number of distinct values of for attribute A associated with b in $\pi_{\mathsf{AB}}(M)$.
- Let $\mathsf{Dom}(C) = \{c_0, c_1, c_2\}$
- $\alpha : \mathsf{Dom}(C) \to \mathsf{Dom}(C)$; $c_i \mapsto c_{(i+1 \mod 3)}$.
- Define $\pi'_{BC}(M) =$
  $\{(b, c) \mid (b, c) \in \pi_{BC}(M)$ and $\#_A(b)$ is odd$\} \cup$
  $\{(b, \alpha(c)) \mid (b, c) \in \pi_{BC}(M)$ and $\#_A(b)$ is even$\}$.
- The updates which are allowed to $E[\mathsf{AB}]$ under constant complement Π'_{BC} are exactly the same as those allowed under constant complement Π'_{BC}.
- Consider the update Insert (a_1, b_0) into Π_{AB}.

Constant complement view:

$\Pi'_{\mathsf{BC}} = (E[\mathsf{BC}], \{\mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{C}\})$

B	C
b_0	c_0
b_1	c_2

Base schema after update:

$(E[\mathsf{ABC}], \{\mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{C}\})$

A	B	C
a_0	b_0	c_2
a_1	b_0	c_2
a_1	b_1	c_1
a_2	b_1	c_1

Order — the Key to Update Uniqueness

- Database states in common data models often admit a natural order structure.

  Example: Relation-by-relation inclusion in the relational model.

- Database morphisms in common data models often preserve this order structure.

  Example: Select-Project-Join *(SPJ)-mappings* in the relational model.

- These properties have been used to establish uniqueness of *direct* complements [Hegner94 JCSS].

Question: Is is possible to extend these results to subdirect complements?

Short Answer:

- It is not generally true that subdirect complements are unique, even in the presence of order constraints.
- Despite this, it can be shown that the reflections of updates which are order based (*i.e.*, insertions or deletions) are unique within the context of closed update strategies.

Key Features of the Order-Based Framework

- The legal databases of a schema $\mathbf{D}$ form a partially order set $(\mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D}), \leq_{\mathbf{D}})$.
- The mapping $\gamma : \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D}) \to \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V})$ of a view $\Gamma = (\mathbf{V}, \gamma)$ is an open poset morphism; *i.e.*,
$$\gamma(M_1) \leq_{\mathbf{V}} \gamma(M_2) \text{ iff } M_1 \leq_{\mathbf{D}} M_2.$$
- For $\{\Gamma_1 = (\mathbf{V}_1, \gamma_1), \Gamma_2 = (\mathbf{V}_2, \gamma_2)\}$ to be a pair of subdirect complements, the decomposition mapping
$$\gamma_1 \times \gamma_2 : \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D}) \to \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V})$$
must be a section (isomorphism into).
- A closed update family for $\mathbf{D}$ is an *order compatible* equivalence relation on $\mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D})$.
- A closed update strategy for the view $\Gamma = (\mathbf{V}, \gamma)$ of $\mathbf{D}$ is subject to three additional order-based conditions.

(upt:6) [View update reflects order.]
If $\rho(M, N)\!\downarrow$ and $\gamma(M) \leq_{\mathbf{V}} N$, then $M \leq_{\mathbf{D}} \rho(M, N)$.

(upt:7) [Chain reflection.]
If $\rho(M_1, N_1)\!\downarrow$ with $M_1 \leq_{\mathbf{D}} \rho(M_1, N_1)$, then for all $M_2 \in \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D})$ with $M_1 \leq_{\mathbf{D}} M_2 \leq_{\mathbf{D}} \rho(M_1, N_1)$, there is an $N_2 \in \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V})$ with $\rho(M_1, N_2) = M_2$.

(upt:8) [Order inheritance.]
If $M_1, M_2 \in \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D})$ with $\gamma(M_1) \leq_{\mathbf{V}} \gamma(M_2)$ and $(\exists N_1, N_2 \in \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V}))(\rho(M_1, N_1) \leq_{\mathbf{D}} \rho(M_2, N_2))$, then $M_1 \leq_{\mathbf{D}} M_2$.

The Main Result

- Let $\mathbf{D}$ be a database schema, and let U be a closed update family for $\mathbf{D}$. A pair $(M_1.M_2) \in U$ is called:
  - (i) a *formal insertion* with respect to U if $M_1 \leq_{\mathbf{D}} M_2$;
  - (ii) a *formal deletion* with respect to U if $M_2 \leq_{\mathbf{D}} M_1$;
  - (iii) an *order-based update* with respect to U if it is realizable as a sequence of formal insertions and deletions.
- The update family U is called *order realizable* if every pair in U is an order-based update.

Main Theorem: (Set in the order-based framework.)

- Let:
  - $\mathbf{D}$ = database schema.
  - $\Gamma = (\mathbf{V}, \gamma)$ = view of $\mathbf{D}$.
  - U = closed update family for $\mathbf{D}$.
  - T = closed update family for $\mathbf{V}$.
  - ρ_1, ρ_2 = closed update strategies for for T with respect to U.
- Then:
  - For any $M \in \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{D})$ and $N \in \mathsf{LDB}(\mathbf{V})$ with $(\gamma(M), N) \in T$ an order-based update, $\rho_1(M, N) = \rho_2(M, N)$.
  - In particular, if T is order realizable, then $\rho_1 = \rho_2$. □

Update Uniqueness in a Relational Example

Base schema:

$(E[\mathsf{ABC}], \{\mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{C}\})$

A	B	C
a_0	b_0	c_0
a_1	b_1	c_1
a_2	b_1	c_1

View to be updated:

View $\Pi_{\mathsf{AB}} = (E[\mathsf{AB}], \emptyset)$

A	B
a_0	b_0
a_1	b_1
a_2	b_1

- Recall that the "natural" update strategy uses the complement Π_{BC}.
- This implies that the allowable updates T are those which hold the meet view Π_{B} constant.
- Observe that every admissible update to Π_{AB} is order based.
  - An update such as

    Replace (a_0, b_0) with (a_3, b_0)

    may be realized as the sequence:

    Insert (a_3, b_0)
    Delete (a_0, b_0).
- Thus, within the order-based framework, there is only one closed update strategy which supports T.
- The bizarre complement Π'_{BC} fails to be order based, and thus the update strategy defined by holding it constant is not within the order-based framework.

Update Uniqueness in a Relational Example II

Base schema:

$(E[\mathsf{ABC}], \{\mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{CA}\})$

A	B	C
a_0	b_0	c_0
a_1	b_1	c_1
a_2	b_2	c_1

View to be updated:

$\Pi_{\mathsf{AB}} = (E[\mathsf{AB}], \{\mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{A}\})$

A	B
a_0	b_0
a_1	b_1
a_2	b_2

- The additional functional dependency $\mathsf{B} \to \mathsf{A}$ blocks the ability to realize all updates as insertions followed by deletions.
- The natural relational ordering cannot be used to guarantee the uniqueness of update reflections in a closed strategy.
- The following trick can be used to establish uniqueness.
  - Let $\preceq_A$ be an arbitrary total order on $\mathsf{Dom}(A)$.
  - Define $\preceq$ on ABC-tuples by $(a_0, b_0, c_0) \preceq (a_1, b_1, c_1)$ iff $((a_0 \preceq_A a_1) \wedge (b_0 = b_1) \wedge (c_0 = c_1))$.
  - Define $\preceq$ on AB-tuples by $(a_0, b_0) \preceq (a_1, b_1)$ iff $((a_0 \preceq_A a_1) \wedge (b_0 = b_1))$.
  - Define $\preceq$ on BC-tuples by $(a_0, b_0) \preceq (a_1, b_1)$ iff $((b_0 = b_1) \wedge (c_0 = c_1))$.
  - Extend $\preceq$ to relations by $R_1 \preceq R_2$ iff $(\forall t_0 \in R_1)(\exists t_1 \in R_2)(t_0 \preceq t_1)$.
  - Under this new ordering, all updates are order based, and so translation is unique.
- Since this new ordering is strictly stronger than the original, the updates are the same as those which arise from the Π_{BC} as constant complement.

Conclusions and Further Directions

Conclusion:

- Order-based techniques are a promising tool for establishing uniqueness of closed update strategies.

Further directions:

- Pursue a much more systematic development of the technique of adding artificial domain orders to establish uniqueness.
- Identify conditions under which there is a unique *greatest* closed update strategy for a view.
  - ⋗ Identify conditions under which a view has a *least-meet* complement.
- Study *view-centered* schema design.
- Examine complexity issues surrounding closed update strategies.