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Chapter 4

Data Warehousing and Online Analytical Processing

Data warehouses generalize and consolidate data in multidimensional space. The construction of data warehouses involves data cleaning, data integration, and data transformation and can be viewed as an important preprocessing step for data mining. Moreover, data warehouses provide online analytical processing (OLAP) tools for the interactive analysis of multidimensional data of varied granularities, which facilitates effective data generalization and data mining. Many other data mining functions, such as association, classification, prediction, and clustering, can be integrated with OLAP operations to enhance interactive mining of knowledge at multiple levels of abstraction. Hence, the data warehouse has become an increasingly important platform for data analysis and online analytical processing and will provide an effective platform for data mining. Therefore, data warehousing and OLAP form an essential step in the knowledge discovery process. This chapter presents an overview of data warehouse and OLAP technology. Such an overview is essential for understanding the overall data mining and knowledge discovery process.

In this chapter, we study a well-accepted definition of the data warehouse and see why more and more organizations are building data warehouses for the analysis of their data (Section 4.1). In particular, we study the data cube, a multidimensional data model for data warehouses and OLAP, as well as OLAP operations such as roll-up, drill-down, slicing, and dicing (Section 4.2). We also look at data warehouse design and usage (Section 4.3). In addition, we discuss multidimensional data mining, a powerful paradigm that integrates data warehouse and OLAP technology with that of data mining. An overview of data warehouse implementation examines general strategies for efficient data cube computation, OLAP data indexing, and OLAP query processing (Section 4.4). Finally, we study data generalization by attribute-oriented induction (Section 4.5). This method uses concept hierarchies to generalize data to mul-


4.1 Data Warehouse: Basic Concepts

This section gives an introduction to data warehouses. We begin with a definition of the data warehouse (Section 4.1.1). We outline the differences between operational database systems and data warehouses (Section 4.1.2), and explain the need for using data warehouses for data analysis, rather than performing the analysis directly on traditional databases (Section 4.1.3). This is followed by a presentation of data warehouse architecture (Section 4.1.4). Next, we study three data warehouse models—an enterprise model, a data mart, and a virtual warehouse (Section 4.1.5). Section 4.1.6 describes back-end utilities for data warehousing, such as extraction, transformation, and loading. Finally, Section 4.1.7 presents the metadata repository, where we store data about our data.

4.1.1 What is a Data Warehouse?

Data warehousing provides architectures and tools for business executives to systematically organize, understand, and use their data to make strategic decisions. Data warehouse systems are valuable tools in today’s competitive, fast-evolving world. In the last several years, many firms have spent millions of dollars in building enterprise-wide data warehouses. Many people feel that with competition mounting in every industry, data warehousing is the latest must-have marketing weapon—a way to retain customers by learning more about their needs.

"Then, what exactly is a data warehouse?" Data warehouses have been defined in many ways, making it difficult to formulate a rigorous definition. Loosely speaking, a data warehouse refers to a data repository that is maintained separately from an organization’s operational databases. Data warehouse systems allow for the integration of a variety of application systems. They support information processing by providing a solid platform of consolidated historical data for analysis.

According to William H. Inmon, a leading architect in the construction of data warehouse systems, “A data warehouse is a subject-oriented, integrated, time-variant, and nonvolatile collection of data in support of management’s decision making process” [Inm96]. This short, but comprehensive definition presents the major features of a data warehouse. The four keywords, subject-oriented, integrated, time-variant, and nonvolatile, distinguish data warehouses from other data repository systems, such as relational database systems, transaction processing systems, and file systems. Let’s take a closer look at each of these key features.

• **Subject-oriented**: A data warehouse is organized around major subjects, such as customer, supplier, product, and sales. Rather than concentrating on the day-to-day operations and transaction processing of an
organization, a data warehouse focuses on the modeling and analysis of data for decision makers. Hence, data warehouses typically provide a simple and concise view around particular subject issues by excluding data that are not useful in the decision support process.

- **Integrated**: A data warehouse is usually constructed by integrating multiple heterogeneous sources, such as relational databases, flat files, and online transaction records. Data cleaning and data integration techniques are applied to ensure consistency in naming conventions, encoding structures, attribute measures, and so on.

- **Time-variant**: Data are stored to provide information from a historical perspective (e.g., the past 5–10 years). Every key structure in the data warehouse contains, either implicitly or explicitly, an element of time.

- **Nonvolatile**: A data warehouse is always a physically separate store of data transformed from the application data found in the operational environment. Due to this separation, a data warehouse does not require transaction processing, recovery, and concurrency control mechanisms. It usually requires only two operations in data accessing: initial loading of data and access of data.

In sum, a data warehouse is a semantically consistent data store that serves as a physical implementation of a decision support data model and stores the information on which an enterprise needs to make strategic decisions. A data warehouse is also often viewed as an architecture, constructed by integrating data from multiple heterogeneous sources to support structured and/or ad hoc queries, analytical reporting, and decision making.

Based on this information, we view data warehousing as the process of constructing and using data warehouses. The construction of a data warehouse requires data cleaning, data integration, and data consolidation. The utilization of a data warehouse often necessitates a collection of decision support technologies. This allows “knowledge workers” (e.g., managers, analysts, and executives) to use the warehouse to quickly and conveniently obtain an overview of the data, and to make sound decisions based on information in the warehouse. Some authors use the term “data warehousing” to refer only to the process of data warehouse construction, while the term “warehouse DBMS” is used to refer to the management and utilization of data warehouses. We will not make this distinction here.

“How are organizations using the information from data warehouses?” Many organizations use this information to support business decision-making activities, including (1) increasing customer focus, which includes the analysis of customer buying patterns (such as buying preference, buying time, budget cycles, and appetites for spending); (2) repositioning products and managing product portfolios by comparing the performance of sales by quarter, by year, and by geographic regions in order to fine-tune production strategies; (3) analyzing operations and looking for sources of profit; and (4) managing customer relation-
ships, making environmental corrections, and managing the cost of corporate assets.

Data warehousing is also very useful from the point of view of heterogeneous database integration. Organizations typically collect diverse kinds of data and maintain large databases from multiple, heterogeneous, autonomous, and distributed information sources. To integrate such data, and provide easy and efficient access to it, is highly desirable, yet challenging. Much effort has been spent in the database industry and research community toward achieving this goal.

The traditional database approach to heterogeneous database integration is to build wrappers and integrators (or mediators), on top of multiple, heterogeneous databases. When a query is posed to a client site, a metadata dictionary is used to translate the query into queries appropriate for the individual heterogeneous sites involved. These queries are then mapped and sent to local query processors. The results returned from the different sites are integrated into a global answer set. This query-driven approach requires complex information filtering and integration processes, and competes with local sites for processing resources. It is inefficient and potentially expensive for frequent queries, especially for queries requiring aggregations.

Data warehousing provides an interesting alternative to the traditional approach of heterogeneous database integration described above. Rather than using a query-driven approach, data warehousing employs an update-driven approach in which information from multiple, heterogeneous sources is integrated in advance and stored in a warehouse for direct querying and analysis. Unlike online transaction processing databases, data warehouses do not contain the most current information. However, a data warehouse brings high performance to the integrated heterogeneous database system because data are copied, preprocessed, integrated, annotated, summarized, and restructured into one semantic data store. Furthermore, query processing in data warehouses does not interfere with the processing at local sources. Moreover, data warehouses can store and integrate historical information and support complex multidimensional queries. As a result, data warehousing has become popular in industry.

4.1.2 Differences between Operational Database Systems and Data Warehouses

Because most people are familiar with commercial relational database systems, it is easy to understand what a data warehouse is by comparing these two kinds of systems.

The major task of online operational database systems is to perform online transaction and query processing. These systems are called online transaction processing (OLTP) systems. They cover most of the day-to-day operations of an organization, such as purchasing, inventory, manufacturing, banking, payroll, registration, and accounting. Data warehouse systems, on the other hand, serve users or knowledge workers in the role of data analysis and decision making.
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Such systems can organize and present data in various formats in order to accommodate the diverse needs of the different users. These systems are known as **online analytical processing (OLAP)** systems.

The major distinguishing features between OLTP and OLAP are summarized as follows:

- **Users and system orientation**: An OLTP system is *customer-oriented* and is used for transaction and query processing by clerks, clients, and information technology professionals. An OLAP system is *market-oriented* and is used for data analysis by knowledge workers, including managers, executives, and analysts.

- **Data contents**: An OLTP system manages current data that, typically, are too detailed to be easily used for decision making. An OLAP system manages large amounts of historical data, provides facilities for summarization and aggregation, and stores and manages information at different levels of granularity. These features make the data easier to use in informed decision making.

- **Database design**: An OLTP system usually adopts an entity-relationship (ER) data model and an application-oriented database design. An OLAP system typically adopts either a *star* or *snowflake* model (to be discussed in Section 4.2.2) and a subject-oriented database design.

- **View**: An OLTP system focuses mainly on the current data within an enterprise or department, without referring to historical data or data in different organizations. In contrast, an OLAP system often spans multiple versions of a database schema, due to the evolutionary process of an organization. OLAP systems also deal with information that originates from different organizations, integrating information from many data stores. Because of their huge volume, OLAP data are stored on multiple storage media.

- **Access patterns**: The access patterns of an OLTP system consist mainly of short, atomic transactions. Such a system requires concurrency control and recovery mechanisms. However, accesses to OLAP systems are mostly read-only operations (because most data warehouses store historical rather than up-to-date information), although many could be complex queries.

Other features that distinguish between OLTP and OLAP systems include database size, frequency of operations, and performance metrics. These are summarized in Table 4.1.

4.1.3 But, Why Have a Separate Data Warehouse?

Because operational databases store huge amounts of data, you may wonder, *why not perform online analytical processing directly on such databases instead*
### Table 4.1: Comparison between OLTP and OLAP systems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>OLTP</th>
<th>OLAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>operational processing</td>
<td>informational processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>transaction</td>
<td>analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>clerk, DBA, database professional</td>
<td>knowledge worker (e.g., manager, executive, analyst)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>day-to-day operations</td>
<td>long-term informational requirements, decision support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB design</td>
<td>ER based, application-oriented</td>
<td>star/snowflake, subject-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>current; guaranteed up-to-date</td>
<td>historical; accuracy maintained over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarization</td>
<td>primitive, highly detailed</td>
<td>summarized, consolidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View</td>
<td>detailed, flat relational</td>
<td>summarized, multidimensional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of work</td>
<td>short, simple transaction</td>
<td>complex query</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>read/write</td>
<td>mostly read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>data in</td>
<td>information out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>index/hash on primary key</td>
<td>lots of scans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of records accessed</td>
<td>tens</td>
<td>millions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of users</td>
<td>thousands</td>
<td>hundreds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB size</td>
<td>GB to high-order GB</td>
<td>≥ TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>high performance, high availability</td>
<td>high flexibility, end-user autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>transaction throughput</td>
<td>query throughput, response time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Table is partially based on [CD97].

... of spending additional time and resources to construct a separate data warehouse?” A major reason for such a separation is to help promote the high performance of both systems. An operational database is designed and tuned from known tasks and workloads, such as indexing and hashing using primary keys, searching for particular records, and optimizing “canned” queries. On the other hand, data warehouse queries are often complex. They involve the computation of large groups of data at summarized levels, and may require the use of special data organization, access, and implementation methods based on multidimensional views. Processing OLAP queries in operational databases would substantially degrade the performance of operational tasks.

Moreover, an operational database supports the concurrent processing of multiple transactions. Concurrency control and recovery mechanisms, such as locking and logging, are required to ensure the consistency and robustness of transactions. An OLAP query often needs read-only access of data records for summarization and aggregation. Concurrency control and recovery mechanisms, if applied for such OLAP operations, may jeopardize the execution of concurrent transactions and thus substantially reduce the throughput of an OLTP system.

Finally, the separation of operational databases from data warehouses is based on the different structures, contents, and uses of the data in these two systems. Decision support requires historical data, whereas operational databases do not typically maintain historical data. In this context, the data in oper-
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Operational databases, though abundant, is usually far from complete for decision making. Decision support requires consolidation (such as aggregation and summarization) of data from heterogeneous sources, resulting in high-quality, clean, and integrated data. In contrast, operational databases contain only detailed raw data, such as transactions, which need to be consolidated before analysis. Because the two systems provide quite different functionalities and require different kinds of data, it is presently necessary to maintain separate databases. However, many vendors of operational relational database management systems are beginning to optimize such systems to support OLAP queries. As this trend continues, the separation between OLTP and OLAP systems is expected to decrease.

4.1.4 Data Warehousing: A Multi-Tiered Architecture

Data warehouses often adopt a three-tier architecture, as presented in Figure 4.1.

1. The bottom tier is a **warehouse database server** that is almost always a relational database system. Back-end tools and utilities are used to feed data into the bottom tier from operational databases or other external sources (such as customer profile information provided by external consultants). These tools and utilities perform data extraction, cleaning, and transformation (e.g., to merge similar data from different sources into a unified format), as well as load and refresh functions to update the data warehouse (Section 4.1.6). The data are extracted using application program interfaces known as **gateways**. A gateway is supported by the underlying DBMS and allows client programs to generate SQL code to be executed at a server. Examples of gateways include ODBC (Open Database Connection) and OLEDB (Object Linking and Embedding, Database) by Microsoft and JDBC (Java Database Connection). This tier also contains a metadata repository, which stores information about the data warehouse and its contents. The metadata repository is further described in Section 4.1.7.

2. The middle tier is an **OLAP server** that is typically implemented using either (1) a **relational OLAP (ROLAP)** model, that is, an extended relational DBMS that maps operations on multidimensional data to standard relational operations; or (2) a **multidimensional OLAP (MOLAP)** model, that is, a special-purpose server that directly implements multidimensional data and operations. OLAP servers are discussed in Section 4.4.4.

3. The top tier is a **front-end client layer**, which contains query and reporting tools, analysis tools, and/or data mining tools (e.g., trend analysis, prediction, and so on).
4.1.5 Data Warehouse Models: Enterprise Warehouse, Data Mart, and Virtual Warehouse

From the architecture point of view, there are three data warehouse models: the enterprise warehouse, the data mart, and the virtual warehouse.

**Enterprise warehouse:** An enterprise warehouse collects all of the information about subjects spanning the entire organization. It provides corporate-wide data integration, usually from one or more operational systems or external information providers, and is cross-functional in scope. It typically contains detailed data as well as summarized data, and can range in size from a few gigabytes to hundreds of gigabytes, terabytes, or beyond. An enterprise data warehouse may be implemented on traditional mainframes, computer superservers, or parallel architecture plat-
forms. It requires extensive business modeling and may take years to design and build.

**Data mart:** A data mart contains a subset of corporate-wide data that is of value to a specific group of users. The scope is confined to specific selected subjects. For example, a marketing data mart may confine its subjects to customer, item, and sales. The data contained in data marts tend to be summarized.

Data marts are usually implemented on low-cost departmental servers that are Unix/Linux- or Windows-based. The implementation cycle of a data mart is more likely to be measured in weeks rather than months or years. However, it may involve complex integration in the long run if its design and planning were not enterprise-wide.

Depending on the source of data, data marts can be categorized as independent or dependent. **Independent** data marts are sourced from data captured from one or more operational systems or external information providers, or from data generated locally within a particular department or geographic area. **Dependent** data marts are sourced directly from enterprise data warehouses.

**Virtual warehouse:** A virtual warehouse is a set of views over operational databases. For efficient query processing, only some of the possible summary views may be materialized. A virtual warehouse is easy to build but requires excess capacity on operational database servers.

“What are the pros and cons of the top-down and bottom-up approaches to data warehouse development?” The top-down development of an enterprise warehouse serves as a systematic solution and minimizes integration problems. However, it is expensive, takes a long time to develop, and lacks flexibility due to the difficulty in achieving consistency and consensus for a common data model for the entire organization. The bottom-up approach to the design, development, and deployment of independent data marts provides flexibility, low cost, and rapid return of investment. It, however, can lead to problems when integrating various disparate data marts into a consistent enterprise data warehouse.

A recommended method for the development of data warehouse systems is to implement the warehouse in an incremental and evolutionary manner, as shown in Figure 4.2. First, a high-level corporate data model is defined within a reasonably short period (such as one or two months) that provides a corporate-wide, consistent, integrated view of data among different subjects and potential usages. This high-level model, although it will need to be refined in the further development of enterprise data warehouses and departmental data marts, will greatly reduce future integration problems. Second, independent data marts can be implemented in parallel with the enterprise warehouse based on the same corporate data model set as above. Third, distributed data marts can be constructed to integrate different data marts via hub servers. Finally, a
multitier data warehouse is constructed where the enterprise warehouse is the sole custodian of all warehouse data, which is then distributed to the various dependent data marts.

4.1.6 Extraction, Transformation, Loading

Data warehouse systems use back-end tools and utilities to populate and refresh their data (Figure 4.1). These tools and utilities include the following functions:

- **Data extraction**, which typically gathers data from multiple, heterogeneous, and external sources
- **Data cleaning**, which detects errors in the data and rectifies them when possible
- **Data transformation**, which converts data from legacy or host format to warehouse format
- **Load**, which sorts, summarizes, consolidates, computes views, checks integrity, and builds indices and partitions
- **Refresh**, which propagates the updates from the data sources to the warehouse

Besides cleaning, loading, refreshing, and metadata definition tools, data warehouse systems usually provide a good set of data warehouse management tools. Data cleaning and data transformation are important steps in improving the quality of the data and, subsequently, of the data mining results. They are described in Chapter 3 on Data Preprocessing. Because we are mostly interested in the aspects of data warehousing technology related to data mining, we will not get into the details of the remaining tools and recommend interested readers to consult books dedicated to data warehousing technology.

![Figure 4.2: A recommended approach for data warehouse development.](image-url)
4.1.7 Metadata Repository

Metadata are data about data. When used in a data warehouse, metadata are the data that define warehouse objects. Figure 4.1 showed a metadata repository within the bottom tier of the data warehousing architecture. Metadata are created for the data names and definitions of the given warehouse. Additional metadata are created and captured for timestamping any extracted data, the source of the extracted data, and missing fields that have been added by data cleaning or integration processes.

A metadata repository should contain the following:

- **A description of the structure of the data warehouse**, which includes the warehouse schema, view, dimensions, hierarchies, and derived data definitions, as well as data mart locations and contents

- **Operational metadata**, which include data lineage (history of migrated data and the sequence of transformations applied to it), currency of data (active, archived, or purged), and monitoring information (warehouse usage statistics, error reports, and audit trails)

- **The algorithms used for summarization**, which include measure and dimension definition algorithms, data on granularity, partitions, subject areas, aggregation, summarization, and predefined queries and reports

- **The mapping from the operational environment to the data warehouse**, which includes source databases and their contents, gateway descriptions, data partitions, data extraction, cleaning, transformation rules and defaults, data refresh and purging rules, and security (user authorization and access control)

- **Data related to system performance**, which include indices and profiles that improve data access and retrieval performance, in addition to rules for the timing and scheduling of refresh, update, and replication cycles

- **Business metadata**, which include business terms and definitions, data ownership information, and charging policies

A data warehouse contains different levels of summarization, of which metadata is one type. Other types include current detailed data (which are almost always on disk), older detailed data (which are usually on tertiary storage), lightly summarized data and highly summarized data (which may or may not be physically housed).

Metadata play a very different role than other data warehouse data and are important for many reasons. For example, metadata are used as a directory to help the decision support system analyst locate the contents of the data warehouse, as a guide to the mapping of data when the data are transformed from the operational environment to the data warehouse environment, and as a guide to the algorithms used for summarization between the current detailed data and the lightly summarized data, and between the lightly summarized
data and the highly summarized data. Metadata should be stored and managed persistently (i.e., on disk).

4.2 Data Warehouse Modeling: Data Cube and OLAP

Data warehouses and OLAP tools are based on a **multidimensional data model**. This model views data in the form of a *data cube*. In this section, you will learn how data cubes model \( n \)-dimensional data (Section 4.2.1). In Section 4.2.2, various multidimensional models are shown (such as the star schema, snowflake schema, and fact constellation). You will also learn about concept hierarchies (Section 4.2.3) and measures (Section 4.2.4) and how they can be used in basic OLAP operations to allow interactive mining at multiple levels of abstraction. Typical OLAP operations such as drill-down and roll-up are illustrated (Section 4.2.5). Finally, the starnet model for querying multidimensional databases is presented (Section 4.2.6).

4.2.1 Data Cube: A Multidimensional Data Model

“What is a data cube?” A **data cube** allows data to be modeled and viewed in multiple dimensions. It is defined by dimensions and facts.

In general terms, **dimensions** are the perspectives or entities with respect to which an organization wants to keep records. For example, *AllElectronics* may create a *sales* data warehouse in order to keep records of the store’s sales with respect to the dimensions *time*, *item*, *branch*, and *location*. These dimensions allow the store to keep track of things like monthly sales of items and the branches and locations at which the items were sold. Each dimension may have a table associated with it, called a **dimension table**, which further describes the dimension. For example, a dimension table for *item* may contain the attributes *item_name*, *brand*, and *type*. Dimension tables can be specified by users or experts, or automatically generated and adjusted based on data distributions.

A multidimensional data model is typically organized around a central theme, like *sales*, for instance. This theme is represented by a fact table. **Facts** are numerical measures. Think of them as the quantities by which we want to analyze relationships between dimensions. Examples of facts for a sales data warehouse include *dollars_sold* (sales amount in dollars), *units_sold* (number of units sold), and *amount_budgeted*. The **fact table** contains the names of the **facts**, or measures, as well as keys to each of the related dimension tables. You will soon get a clearer picture of how this works when we look at multidimensional schemas.

Although we usually think of cubes as 3-D geometric structures, in data warehousing the data cube is \( n \)-dimensional. To gain a better understanding of data cubes and the multidimensional data model, let’s start by looking at a simple 2-D data cube that is, in fact, a table or spreadsheet for sales data from *AllElectronics*. In particular, we will look at the *AllElectronics* sales data
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Table 4.2: A 2-D view of sales data for AllElectronics according to the dimensions time and item, where the sales are from branches located in the city of Vancouver. The measure displayed is dollars\_sold (in thousands).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location = “Vancouver”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time (quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: A 3-D view of sales data for AllElectronics, according to the dimensions time, item, and location. The measure displayed is dollars\_sold (in thousands).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location = “Chicago”</th>
<th>location = “New York”</th>
<th>location = “Toronto”</th>
<th>location = “Vancouver”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>item</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>ent.</td>
<td>comp.</td>
<td>phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, suppose that we would like to view the sales data with a third dimension. For instance, suppose we would like to view the data according to time and item, as well as location for the cities Chicago, New York, Toronto, and Vancouver. These 3-D data are shown in Table 4.3. The 3-D data of Table 4.3 are represented as a series of 2-D tables. Conceptually, we may also represent the same data in the form of a 3-D data cube, as in Figure 4.3.

Suppose that we would now like to view our sales data with an additional fourth dimension, such as supplier. Viewing things in 4-D becomes tricky. However, we can think of a 4-D cube as being a series of 3-D cubes, as shown in Figure 4.4. If we continue in this way, we may display any n-D data as a series of (n − 1)-D “cubes.” The data cube is a metaphor for multidimensional data storage. The actual physical storage of such data may differ from its logical representation. The important thing to remember is that data cubes are
n-dimensional and do not confine data to 3-D.

The above tables show the data at different degrees of summarization. In the data warehousing research literature, a data cube such as each of the above is often referred to as a **cuboid**. Given a set of dimensions, we can generate a cuboid for each of the possible subsets of the given dimensions. The result would form a **lattice** of cuboids, each showing the data at a different level of summarization, or **group by**. The lattice of cuboids is then referred to as a data cube. Figure 4.5 shows a lattice of cuboids forming a data cube for the dimensions *time*, *item*, *location*, and *supplier*.

The cuboid that holds the lowest level of summarization is called the **base cuboid**. For example, the 4-D cuboid in Figure 4.4 is the base cuboid for the given *time*, *item*, *location*, and *supplier* dimensions. Figure 4.3 is a 3-D (nonbase) cuboid for *time*, *item*, and *location*, summarized for all suppliers. The 0-D cuboid, which holds the highest level of summarization, is called the **apex cuboid**. In our example, this is the total sales, or *dollars_sold*, summarized over all four dimensions. The apex cuboid is typically denoted by **all**.

### 4.2.2 Stars, Snowflakes, and Fact Constellations: Schemas for Multidimensional Data Models

The entity-relationship data model is commonly used in the design of relational databases, where a database schema consists of a set of entities and the relationships between them. Such a data model is appropriate for online transaction processing. A data warehouse, however, requires a concise, subject-oriented schema that facilitates online data analysis.

The most popular data model for a data warehouse is a **multidimensional**
model. Such a model can exist in the form of a star schema, a snowflake schema, or a fact constellation schema. Let’s look at each of these schema types.

**Star schema:** The most common modeling paradigm is the star schema, in which the data warehouse contains (1) a large central table (fact table) containing the bulk of the data, with no redundancy, and (2) a set of smaller attendant tables (dimension tables), one for each dimension. The schema graph resembles a starburst, with the dimension tables displayed in a radial pattern around the central fact table.

**Example 4.1 Star schema.** A star schema for AllElectronics sales is shown in Figure 4.6. Sales are considered along four dimensions, namely, time, item, branch, and location. The schema contains a central fact table for sales that contains keys to each of the four dimensions, along with two measures: dollars_sold and units_sold. To minimize the size of the fact table, dimension identifiers (such as time_key and item_key) are system-generated identifiers.

Notice that in the star schema, each dimension is represented by only one table, and each table contains a set of attributes. For example, the location dimension table contains the attribute set \{location_key, street, city, province_or_state, country\}. This constraint may introduce some redundancy. For example, “Urbana” and “Chicago” are both cities in the state of Illinois, USA. Entries for such cities in the location dimension table will create redundancy among the attributes province_or_state and country, that is, (... Urbana, IL, USA) and (... Chicago, IL, USA). Moreover, the attributes within a dimension table may form either a hierarchy (total order) or a lattice (partial order).

**Snowflake schema:** The snowflake schema is a variant of the star schema model, where some dimension tables are normalized, thereby further splitting the data into additional tables. The resulting schema graph forms a shape similar to a snowflake.
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The major difference between the snowflake and star schema models is that the dimension tables of the snowflake model may be kept in normalized form to reduce redundancies. Such a table is easy to maintain and saves storage space. However, this saving of space is negligible in comparison to the typical magnitude of the fact table. Furthermore, the snowflake structure can reduce the effectiveness of browsing, since more joins will be needed to execute a query. Consequently, the system performance may be adversely impacted. Hence, although the snowflake schema reduces redundancy, it is not as popular as the star schema in data warehouse design.

Example 4.2 **Snowflake schema.** A snowflake schema for *AllElectronics* sales is given in Figure 4.7. Here, the *sales* fact table is identical to that of the star schema in Figure 4.6. The main difference between the two schemas is in the definition of dimension tables. The single dimension table for *item* in the star schema is normalized in the snowflake schema, resulting in new *item* and *supplier* tables. For example, the *item* dimension table now contains the attributes *item_key*, *item_name*, *brand*, *type*, and *supplier_key*, where *supplier_key* is linked to the *supplier* dimension table, containing *supplier_key* and *supplier_type* information. Similarly, the single dimension table for *location* in the star schema can be normalized into two new tables: *location* and *city*. The *city_key* in the new *location* table links to the *city* dimension. Notice that further normalization can be performed on *province* or *state* and *country* in the snowflake schema.
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shown in Figure 4.7, when desirable.

**Fact constellation:** Sophisticated applications may require multiple fact tables to share dimension tables. This kind of schema can be viewed as a collection of stars, and hence is called a galaxy schema or a fact constellation.

Example 4.3 Fact constellation. A fact constellation schema is shown in Figure 4.8. This schema specifies two fact tables, sales and shipping. The sales table definition is identical to that of the star schema (Figure 4.6). The shipping table has five dimensions, or keys: item_key, time_key, shipper_key, from_location, and to_location, and two measures: dollars_cost and units_shipped. A fact constellation schema allows dimension tables to be shared between fact tables. For example, the dimensions tables for time, item, and location are shared between both the sales and shipping fact tables.

In data warehousing, there is a distinction between a data warehouse and a data mart. A data warehouse collects information about subjects that span the entire organization, such as customers, items, sales, assets, and personnel, and thus its scope is enterprise-wide. For data warehouses, the fact constellation schema is commonly used, since it can model multiple, interrelated subjects. A data mart, on the other hand, is a department subset of the data warehouse that focuses on selected subjects, and thus its scope is department-wide. For data marts, the star or snowflake schema are commonly used, since both are geared toward modeling single subjects, although the star schema is more popular and efficient.
4.2.3 Dimensions: The Role of Concept Hierarchies

A concept hierarchy defines a sequence of mappings from a set of low-level concepts to higher-level, more general concepts. Consider a concept hierarchy for the dimension location. City values for location include Vancouver, Toronto, New York, and Chicago. Each city, however, can be mapped to the province or state to which it belongs. For example, Vancouver can be mapped to British Columbia, and Chicago to Illinois. The provinces and states can in turn be mapped to the country to which they belong, such as Canada or the USA. These mappings form a concept hierarchy for the dimension location, mapping a set of low-level concepts (i.e., cities) to higher-level, more general concepts (i.e., countries). The concept hierarchy described above is illustrated in Figure 4.9.

Many concept hierarchies are implicit within the database schema. For example, suppose that the dimension location is described by the attributes number, street, city, province_or_state, zipcode, and country. These attributes are related by a total order, forming a concept hierarchy such as “street < city < province_or_state < country”. This hierarchy is shown in Figure 4.10(a). Alternatively, the attributes of a dimension may be organized in a partial order, forming a lattice. An example of a partial order for the time dimension based on the attributes day, week, month, quarter, and year is “day < {month < quarter; week} < year”. This lattice structure is shown in Figure 4.10(b). A concept hierarchy that is a total or partial order among attributes in a database schema is called a schema.

1Since a week often crosses the boundary of two consecutive months, it is usually not treated as a lower abstraction of month. Instead, it is often treated as a lower abstraction of year, since a year contains approximately 52 weeks.
hierarchy. Concept hierarchies that are common to many applications may be predefined in the data mining system, such as the concept hierarchy for time. Data mining systems should provide users with the flexibility to tailor predefined hierarchies according to their particular needs. For example, users may like to define a fiscal year starting on April 1 or an academic year starting on September 1.

Concept hierarchies may also be defined by discretizing or grouping values for a given dimension or attribute, resulting in a set-grouping hierarchy. A total or partial order can be defined among groups of values. An example of a set-grouping hierarchy is shown in Figure 4.11 for the dimension price, where an interval \([X \ldots Y]\) denotes the range from \(X\) (exclusive) to \(Y\) (inclusive).

There may be more than one concept hierarchy for a given attribute or dimension, based on different user viewpoints. For instance, a user may prefer to organize price by defining ranges for inexpensive, moderately priced, and expensive.

Concept hierarchies may be provided manually by system users, domain experts, or knowledge engineers, or may be automatically generated based on statistical analysis of the data distribution. The automatic generation of concept hierarchies is discussed in Chapter 3 as a preprocessing step in preparation for data mining.

Concept hierarchies allow data to be handled at varying levels of abstraction, as we shall see in the following subsection.
### Measures: Their Categorization and Computation

**“How are measures computed?”** To answer this question, we first study how measures can be categorized. Note that a multidimensional point in the data cube space can be defined by a set of dimension-value pairs, for example, \( \text{time} = “Q1”, \text{location} = “Vancouver”, \text{item} = “computer” \). A data cube measure is a numerical function that can be evaluated at each point in the data cube space. A measure value is computed for a given point by aggregating the data corresponding to the respective dimension-value pairs defining the given point. We will look at concrete examples of this shortly.

Measures can be organized into three categories (i.e., distributive, algebraic, holistic), based on the kind of aggregate functions used.

**Distributive:** An aggregate function is *distributive* if it can be computed in a distributed manner as follows. Suppose the data are partitioned into \( n \) sets. We apply the function to each partition, resulting in \( n \) aggregate values. If the result derived by applying the function to the \( n \) aggregate values is the same as that derived by applying the function to the entire data set (without partitioning), the function can be computed in a distributed manner. For example, \( \text{sum()} \) can be computed for a data cube by first partitioning the cube into a set of subcubes, computing \( \text{sum()} \) for each subcube, and then summing up the counts obtained for each subcube. Hence, \( \text{sum()} \) is a distributive aggregate function. For the same reason, \( \text{count()}, \text{min()}, \text{and max()} \) are distributive aggregate functions. By treating the count value of each nonempty base cell as 1 by default, \( \text{count()} \) of any cell in a cube can be viewed as the sum of the count values of all of its corresponding child cells in its subcube. Thus, \( \text{count()} \)
Figure 4.10: Hierarchical and lattice structures of attributes in warehouse dimensions: (a) a hierarchy for location; (b) a lattice for time.

Figure 4.11: A concept hierarchy for the attribute price.

is distributive. A measure is distributive if it is obtained by applying a distributive aggregate function. Distributive measures can be computed efficiently because of the way the computation can be partitioned.

**Algebraic:** An aggregate function is algebraic if it can be computed by an algebraic function with $M$ arguments (where $M$ is a bounded positive integer), each of which is obtained by applying a distributive aggregate function.

For example, $\text{avg()}$ (average) can be computed by $\text{sum()}/\text{count()}$, where both $\text{sum()}$ and $\text{count()}$ are distributive aggregate functions. Similarly, it can be shown that $\text{min}_{N}()$ and $\text{max}_{N}()$ (which find the $N$ minimum and $N$ maximum values, respectively, in a given set) and $\text{standard} \_\text{deviation}()$ are algebraic aggregate functions. A measure is algebraic if it is obtained by applying an algebraic aggregate function.

**Holistic:** An aggregate function is holistic if there is no constant bound on
the storage size needed to describe a subaggregate. That is, there does not exist an algebraic function with $M$ arguments (where $M$ is a constant) that characterizes the computation. Common examples of holistic functions include $\text{median}()$, $\text{mode}()$, and $\text{rank}()$. A measure is holistic if it is obtained by applying a holistic aggregate function.

Most large data cube applications require efficient computation of distributive and algebraic measures. Many efficient techniques for this exist. In contrast, it is difficult to compute holistic measures efficiently. Efficient techniques to approximate the computation of some holistic measures, however, do exist. For example, rather than computing the exact $\text{median}()$, Equation (2.3) of Chapter 2 can be used to estimate the approximate median value for a large data set. In many cases, such techniques are sufficient to overcome the difficulties of efficient computation of holistic measures.

Various methods for computing different measures in the construction of data cubes are discussed in-depth in Chapter 5. Notice that most of the current data cube technology confines the measures of multidimensional databases to numerical data. However, measures can also be applied to other kinds of data, such as spatial, multimedia, or text data. Modeling and computing such measures will be discussed in Volume 2.

4.2.5 Typical OLAP Operations

“How are concept hierarchies useful in OLAP?” In the multidimensional model, data are organized into multiple dimensions, and each dimension contains multiple levels of abstraction defined by concept hierarchies. This organization provides users with the flexibility to view data from different perspectives. A number of OLAP data cube operations exist to materialize these different views, allowing interactive querying and analysis of the data at hand. Hence, OLAP provides a user-friendly environment for interactive data analysis.

Example 4.4 OLAP operations. Let’s look at some typical OLAP operations for multidimensional data. Each of the operations described below is illustrated in Figure 4.12. At the center of the figure is a data cube for AllElectronics sales. The cube contains the dimensions $\text{location}$, $\text{time}$, and $\text{item}$, where $\text{location}$ is aggregated with respect to city values, $\text{time}$ is aggregated with respect to quarters, and $\text{item}$ is aggregated with respect to item types. To aid in our explanation, we refer to this cube as the central cube. The measure displayed is $\text{dollars_sold}$ (in thousands). (For improved readability, only some of the cubes’ cell values are shown.) The data examined are for the cities Chicago, New York, Toronto, and Vancouver.

Roll-up: The roll-up operation (also called the drill-up operation by some vendors) performs aggregation on a data cube, either by climbing up a concept hierarchy for a dimension or by dimension reduction. Figure 4.12 shows the result of a roll-up operation performed on the central cube by
climbing up the concept hierarchy for location given in Figure 4.9. This hierarchy was defined as the total order "street < city < province or state < country." The roll-up operation shown aggregates the data by ascending the location hierarchy from the level of city to the level of country. In other words, rather than grouping the data by city, the resulting cube groups the data by country.

When roll-up is performed by dimension reduction, one or more dimensions are removed from the given cube. For example, consider a sales data cube containing only the two dimensions location and time. Roll-up may be performed by removing, say, the time dimension, resulting in an aggregation of the total sales by location, rather than by location and by time.

**Drill-down:** Drill-down is the reverse of roll-up. It navigates from less detailed data to more detailed data. Drill-down can be realized by either stepping down a concept hierarchy for a dimension or introducing additional dimen-
Figure 4.12 shows the result of a drill-down operation performed on the central cube by stepping down a concept hierarchy for time defined as “day < month < quarter < year.” Drill-down occurs by descending the time hierarchy from the level of quarter to the more detailed level of month. The resulting data cube details the total sales per month rather than summarizing them by quarter.

Because a drill-down adds more detail to the given data, it can also be performed by adding new dimensions to a cube. For example, a drill-down on the central cube of Figure 4.12 can occur by introducing an additional dimension, such as customer group.

Slice and dice: The slice operation performs a selection on one dimension of the given cube, resulting in a subcube. Figure 4.12 shows a slice operation where the sales data are selected from the central cube for the dimension time using the criterion time = “Q1”. The dice operation defines a sub-cube by performing a selection on two or more dimensions. Figure 4.12 shows a dice operation on the central cube based on the following selection criteria that involve three dimensions: (location = “Toronto” or “Vancouver”) and (time = “Q1” or “Q2”) and (item = “home entertainment” or “computer”).

Pivot (rotate): Pivot (also called rotate) is a visualization operation that rotates the data axes in view in order to provide an alternative presentation of the data. Figure 4.12 shows a pivot operation where the item and location axes in a 2-D slice are rotated. Other examples include rotating the axes in a 3-D cube, or transforming a 3-D cube into a series of 2-D planes.

Other OLAP operations: Some OLAP systems offer additional drilling operations. For example, drill-across executes queries involving (i.e., across) more than one fact table. The drill-through operation uses relational SQL facilities to drill through the bottom level of a data cube down to its back-end relational tables.

Other OLAP operations may include ranking the top $N$ or bottom $N$ items in lists, as well as computing moving averages, growth rates, interests, internal rates of return, depreciation, currency conversions, and statistical functions.

OLAP offers analytical modeling capabilities, including a calculation engine for deriving ratios, variance, and so on, and for computing measures across multiple dimensions. It can generate summarizations, aggregations, and hierarchies at each granularity level and at every dimension intersection. OLAP also supports functional models for forecasting, trend analysis, and statistical analysis. In this context, an OLAP engine is a powerful data analysis tool.
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OLAP Systems versus Statistical Databases

Many of the characteristics of OLAP systems, such as the use of a multi-dimensional data model and concept hierarchies, the association of measures with dimensions, and the notions of roll-up and drill-down, also exist in earlier work on statistical databases (SDBs). A statistical database is a database system that is designed to support statistical applications. Similarities between the two types of systems are rarely discussed, mainly due to differences in terminology and application domains.

OLAP and SDB systems, however, have distinguishing differences. While SDBs tend to focus on socioeconomic applications, OLAP has been targeted for business applications. Privacy issues regarding concept hierarchies are a major concern for SDBs. For example, given summarized socioeconomic data, it is controversial to allow users to view the corresponding low-level data. Finally, unlike SDBs, OLAP systems are designed for handling huge amounts of data efficiently.

4.2.6 A Starnet Query Model for Querying Multidimensional Databases

The querying of multidimensional databases can be based on a starnet model. A starnet model consists of radial lines emanating from a central point, where each line represents a concept hierarchy for a dimension. Each abstraction level in the hierarchy is called a footprint. These represent the granularities available for use by OLAP operations such as drill-down and roll-up.

Example 4.5 Starnet. A starnet query model for the AllElectronics data warehouse is shown in Figure 4.13. This starnet consists of four radial lines, representing concept hierarchies for the dimensions location, customer, item, and time, respectively. Each line consists of footprints representing abstraction levels of the dimension. For example, the time line has four footprints: “day,” “month,” “quarter,” and “year.” A concept hierarchy may involve a single attribute (like date for the time hierarchy) or several attributes (e.g., the concept hierarchy for location involves the attributes street, city, province_or_state, and country). In order to examine the item sales at AllElectronics, users can roll up along the time dimension from month to quarter, or, say, drill down along the location dimension from country to city. Concept hierarchies can be used to generalize data by replacing low-level values (such as “day” for the time dimension) by higher-level abstractions (such as “year”), or to specialize data by replacing higher-level abstractions with lower-level values.

4.3 Data Warehouse Design and Usage

“What goes into the design of a data warehouse? How are data warehouses used? How do data warehousing and OLAP relate to data mining?” This section tackles these questions. We study the design and usage of data warehousing
for information processing, analytical processing, and data mining. We begin
by presenting a business analysis framework for data warehouse design (Sec-
section 4.3.1). Section 4.3.2 looks at the design process, while Section 4.3.3 studies
data warehouse usage. Finally, Section 4.3.4 describes multidimensional data
mining a powerful paradigm that integrates OLAP with data mining technol-
ogy.

4.3.1 A Business Analysis Framework for Data Warehouse
Design

“What can business analysts gain from having a data warehouse?” First, having
a data warehouse may provide a competitive advantage by presenting relevant
information from which to measure performance and make critical adjustments
in order to help win over competitors. Second, a data warehouse can enhance
business productivity because it is able to quickly and efficiently gather infor-
mation that accurately describes the organization. Third, a data warehouse
facilitates customer relationship management because it provides a consistent
view of customers and items across all lines of business, all departments, and all
markets. Finally, a data warehouse may bring about cost reduction by tracking
trends, patterns, and exceptions over long periods in a consistent and reliable
manner.

To design an effective data warehouse we need to understand and analyze
business needs and construct a business analysis framework. The construction

Figure 4.13: Modeling business queries: a starnet model.
of a large and complex information system can be viewed as the construction of a large and complex building, for which the owner, architect, and builder have different views. These views are combined to form a complex framework that represents the top-down, business-driven, or owner’s perspective, as well as the bottom-up, builder-driven, or implementor’s view of the information system.

Four different views regarding the design of a data warehouse must be considered: the top-down view, the data source view, the data warehouse view, and the business query view.

- The top-down view allows the selection of the relevant information necessary for the data warehouse. This information matches the current and future business needs.

- The data source view exposes the information being captured, stored, and managed by operational systems. This information may be documented at various levels of detail and accuracy, from individual data source tables to integrated data source tables. Data sources are often modeled by traditional data modeling techniques, such as the entity-relationship model or CASE (computer-aided software engineering) tools.

- The data warehouse view includes fact tables and dimension tables. It represents the information that is stored inside the data warehouse, including precalculated totals and counts, as well as information regarding the source, date, and time of origin, added to provide historical context.

- Finally, the business query view is the perspective of data in the data warehouse from the viewpoint of the end user.

Building and using a data warehouse is a complex task because it requires business skills, technology skills, and program management skills. Regarding business skills, building a data warehouse involves understanding how such systems store and manage their data, how to build extractors that transfer data from the operational system to the data warehouse, and how to build warehouse refresh software that keeps the data warehouse reasonably up-to-date with the operational system’s data. Using a data warehouse involves understanding the significance of the data it contains, as well as understanding and translating the business requirements into queries that can be satisfied by the data warehouse. Regarding technology skills, data analysts are required to understand how to make assessments from quantitative information and derive facts based on conclusions from historical information in the data warehouse. These skills include the ability to discover patterns and trends, to extrapolate trends based on history and look for anomalies or paradigm shifts, and to present coherent managerial recommendations based on such analysis. Finally, program management skills involve the need to interface with many technologies, vendors, and end users in order to deliver results in a timely and cost-effective manner.
4.3.2 The Data Warehouse Design Process

Let’s look at various approaches to the process of data warehouse design and the steps involved.

A data warehouse can be built using a top-down approach, a bottom-up approach, or a combination of both. The top-down approach starts with the overall design and planning. It is useful in cases where the technology is mature and well known, and where the business problems that must be solved are clear and well understood. The bottom-up approach starts with experiments and prototypes. This is useful in the early stage of business modeling and technology development. It allows an organization to move forward at considerably less expense and to evaluate the benefits of the technology before making significant commitments. In the combined approach, an organization can exploit the planned and strategic nature of the top-down approach while retaining the rapid implementation and opportunistic application of the bottom-up approach.

From the software engineering point of view, the design and construction of a data warehouse may consist of the following steps: planning, requirements study, problem analysis, warehouse design, data integration and testing, and finally deployment of the data warehouse. Large software systems can be developed using two methodologies: the waterfall method or the spiral method. The waterfall method performs a structured and systematic analysis at each step before proceeding to the next, which is like a waterfall, falling from one step to the next. The spiral method involves the rapid generation of increasingly functional systems, with short intervals between successive releases. This is considered a good choice for data warehouse development, especially for data marts, because the turnaround time is short, modifications can be done quickly, and new designs and technologies can be adapted in a timely manner.

In general, the warehouse design process consists of the following steps:

1. Choose a business process to model, for example, orders, invoices, shipments, inventory, account administration, sales, or the general ledger. If the business process is organizational and involves multiple complex object collections, a data warehouse model should be followed. However, if the process is departmental and focuses on the analysis of one kind of business process, a data mart model should be chosen.

2. Choose the grain of the business process. The grain is the fundamental, atomic level of data to be represented in the fact table for this process, for example, individual transactions, individual daily snapshots, and so on.

3. Choose the dimensions that will apply to each fact table record. Typical dimensions are time, item, customer, supplier, warehouse, transaction type, and status.

4. Choose the measures that will populate each fact table record. Typical measures are numeric additive quantities like dollars sold and units sold.

Because data warehouse construction is a difficult and long-term task, its implementation scope should be clearly defined. The goals of an initial data
4.3. DATA WAREHOUSE DESIGN AND USAGE

warehouse implementation should be specific, achievable, and measurable. This involves determining the time and budget allocations, the subset of the organization that is to be modeled, the number of data sources selected, and the number and types of departments to be served.

Once a data warehouse is designed and constructed, the initial deployment of the warehouse includes initial installation, roll-out planning, training, and orientation. Platform upgrades and maintenance must also be considered. Data warehouse administration includes data refreshment, data source synchronization, planning for disaster recovery, managing access control and security, managing data growth, managing database performance, and data warehouse enhancement and extension. Scope management includes controlling the number and range of queries, dimensions, and reports; limiting the size of the data warehouse; or limiting the schedule, budget, or resources.

Various kinds of data warehouse design tools are available. Data warehouse development tools provide functions to define and edit metadata repository contents (such as schemas, scripts, or rules), answer queries, output reports, and ship metadata to and from relational database system catalogues. Planning and analysis tools study the impact of schema changes and of refresh performance when changing refresh rates or time windows.

4.3.3 Data Warehouse Usage for Information Processing

Data warehouses and data marts are used in a wide range of applications. Business executives use the data in data warehouses and data marts to perform data analysis and make strategic decisions. In many firms, data warehouses are used as an integral part of a plan-execute-assess “closed-loop” feedback system for enterprise management. Data warehouses are used extensively in banking and financial services, consumer goods and retail distribution sectors, and controlled manufacturing, such as demand-based production.

Typically, the longer a data warehouse has been in use, the more it will have evolved. This evolution takes place throughout a number of phases. Initially, the data warehouse is mainly used for generating reports and answering predefined queries. Progressively, it is used to analyze summarized and detailed data, where the results are presented in the form of reports and charts. Later, the data warehouse is used for strategic purposes, performing multidimensional analysis and sophisticated slice-and-dice operations. Finally, the data warehouse may be employed for knowledge discovery and strategic decision making using data mining tools. In this context, the tools for data warehousing can be categorized into access and retrieval tools, database reporting tools, data analysis tools, and data mining tools.

Business users need to have the means to know what exists in the data warehouse (through metadata), how to access the contents of the data warehouse, how to examine the contents using analysis tools, and how to present the results of such analysis.

There are three kinds of data warehouse applications: information processing, analytical processing, and data mining:
• **Information processing** supports querying, basic statistical analysis, and reporting using crosstabs, tables, charts, or graphs. A current trend in data warehouse information processing is to construct low-cost Web-based accessing tools that are then integrated with Web browsers.

• **Analytical processing** supports basic OLAP operations, including slice-and-dice, drill-down, roll-up, and pivoting. It generally operates on historical data in both summarized and detailed forms. The major strength of online analytical processing over information processing is the multidimensional data analysis of data warehouse data.

• **Data mining** supports knowledge discovery by finding hidden patterns and associations, constructing analytical models, performing classification and prediction, and presenting the mining results using visualization tools.

“How does data mining relate to information processing and online analytical processing?” Information processing, based on queries, can find useful information. However, answers to such queries reflect the information directly stored in databases or computable by aggregate functions. They do not reflect sophisticated patterns or regularities buried in the database. Therefore, information processing is not data mining.

Online analytical processing comes a step closer to data mining because it can derive information summarized at multiple granularities from user-specified subsets of a data warehouse. Such descriptions are equivalent to the class/concept descriptions discussed in Chapter 1. Because data mining systems can also mine generalized class/concept descriptions, this raises some interesting questions: “Do OLAP systems perform data mining? Are OLAP systems actually data mining systems?”

The functionalities of OLAP and data mining can be viewed as disjoint: OLAP is a data summarization/aggregation tool that helps simplify data analysis, while data mining allows the automated discovery of implicit patterns and interesting knowledge hidden in large amounts of data. OLAP tools are targeted toward simplifying and supporting interactive data analysis, whereas the goal of data mining tools is to automate as much of the process as possible, while still allowing users to guide the process. In this sense, data mining goes one step beyond traditional online analytical processing.

An alternative and broader view of data mining may be adopted in which data mining covers both data description and data modeling. Because OLAP systems can present general descriptions of data from data warehouses, OLAP functions are essentially for user-directed data summarization and comparison (by drilling, pivoting, slicing, dicing, and other operations). These are, though limited, data mining functionalities. Yet according to this view, data mining covers a much broader spectrum than simple OLAP operations because it performs not only data summarization and comparison but also association, classification, prediction, clustering, time-series analysis, and other data analysis tasks.
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Data mining is not confined to the analysis of data stored in data warehouses. It may analyze data existing at more detailed granularities than the summarized data provided in a data warehouse. It may also analyze transactional, spatial, textual, and multimedia data that are difficult to model with current multidimensional database technology. In this context, data mining covers a broader spectrum than OLAP with respect to data mining functionality and the complexity of the data handled.

Because data mining involves more automated and deeper analysis than OLAP, data mining is expected to have broader applications. Data mining can help business managers find and reach more suitable customers, as well as gain critical business insights that may help drive market share and raise profits. In addition, data mining can help managers understand customer group characteristics and develop optimal pricing strategies accordingly, correct item bundling based not on intuition but on actual item groups derived from customer purchase patterns, reduce promotional spending, and at the same time increase the overall net effectiveness of promotions.

4.3.4 From Online Analytical Processing to Multidimensional Data Mining

The field of data mining has conducted substantial research regarding mining on various types of data, including relational data, data from data warehouses, transaction data, time-series data, spatial data, text data, and flat files. Multidimensional data mining (also known as exploratory multidimensional data mining, online analytical mining, or OLAM) integrates online analytical processing (OLAP) with data mining to uncover knowledge in multidimensional databases. Among the many different paradigms and architectures of data mining systems, multidimensional data mining is particularly important for the following reasons:

- **High quality of data in data warehouses**: Most data mining tools need to work on integrated, consistent, and cleaned data, which requires costly data cleaning, data integration, and data transformation as preprocessing steps. A data warehouse constructed by such preprocessing serves as a valuable source of high-quality data for OLAP as well as for data mining. Notice that data mining may also serve as a valuable tool for data cleaning and data integration as well.

- **Available information processing infrastructure surrounding data warehouses**: Comprehensive information processing and data analysis infrastructures have been or will be systematically constructed surrounding data warehouses, which include accessing, integration, consolidation, and transformation of multiple heterogeneous databases, ODBC/OLE DB connections, Web-accessing and service facilities, and reporting and OLAP analysis tools. It is prudent to make the best use of the available infrastructures rather than constructing everything from scratch.
OLAP-based exploration of multidimensional data: Effective data mining needs exploratory data analysis. A user will often want to traverse through a database, select portions of relevant data, analyze them at different granularities, and present knowledge/results in different forms. Multidimensional data mining provides facilities for mining on different subsets of data and at varying levels of abstraction, by drilling, pivoting, filtering, dicing, and slicing on a data cube and/or intermediate data mining results. This, together with data/knowledge visualization tools, greatly enhance the power and flexibility of data mining.

Online selection of data mining functions: Users may not always know the specific kinds of knowledge they would like to mine. By integrating OLAP with various data mining functions, multidimensional data mining provides users with the flexibility to select desired data mining functions and swap data mining tasks dynamically.

Chapter 5 describe data warehouses on a finer level by exploring implementation issues such as data cube computation, OLAP query answering strategies, and multidimensional data mining. The chapters following it are devoted to the study of data mining techniques. As we have seen, the introduction to data warehousing and OLAP technology presented in this chapter is essential to our study of data mining. This is because data warehousing provides users with large amounts of clean, organized, and summarized data, which greatly facilitates data mining. For example, rather than storing the details of each sales transaction, a data warehouse may store a summary of the transactions per item type for each branch or, summarized to a higher level, for each country. The capability of OLAP to provide multiple and dynamic views of summarized data in a data warehouse sets a solid foundation for successful data mining.

Moreover, we also believe that data mining should be a human-centered process. Rather than asking a data mining system to generate patterns and knowledge automatically, a user will often need to interact with the system to perform exploratory data analysis. OLAP sets a good example for interactive data analysis and provides the necessary preparations for exploratory data mining. Consider the discovery of association patterns, for example. Instead of mining associations at a primitive (i.e., low) data level among transactions, users should be allowed to specify roll-up operations along any dimension. For example, a user may like to roll up on the item dimension to go from viewing the data for particular TV sets that were purchased to viewing the brands of these TVs, such as SONY or Toshiba. Users may also navigate from the transaction level to the customer level or customer-type level in the search for interesting associations. Such an OLAP-style of data mining is characteristic of multidimensional data mining. In our study of the principles of data mining in this book, we place particular emphasis on multidimensional data mining, that is, on the integration of data mining and OLAP technology.
4.4 Data Warehouse Implementation

Data warehouses contain huge volumes of data. OLAP servers demand that decision support queries be answered in the order of seconds. Therefore, it is crucial for data warehouse systems to support highly efficient cube computation techniques, access methods, and query processing techniques. In this section, we present an overview of methods for the efficient implementation of data warehouse systems. Section 4.4.1 explores how to compute data cubes efficiently. Section 4.4.2 shows how OLAP data can be indexed, using either bitmap or join indices. Next, we study how OLAP queries are processed (Section 4.4.3). Finally, Section 4.4.4 presents various types of warehouse servers for OLAP processing.

4.4.1 Efficient Data Cube Computation: An Overview

At the core of multidimensional data analysis is the efficient computation of aggregations across many sets of dimensions. In SQL terms, these aggregations are referred to as group-by’s. Each group-by can be represented by a cuboid, where the set of group-by’s forms a lattice of cuboids defining a data cube. In this section, we explore issues relating to the efficient computation of data cubes.

The compute cube Operator and the Curse of Dimensionality

One approach to cube computation extends SQL so as to include a compute cube operator. The compute cube operator computes aggregates over all subsets of the dimensions specified in the operation. This can require excessive storage space, especially for large numbers of dimensions. We start with an intuitive look at what is involved in the efficient computation of data cubes.

Example 4.6 A data cube is a lattice of cuboids. Suppose that you would like to create a data cube for AllElectronics sales that contains the following: city, item, year, and sales_in_dollars. You would like to be able to analyze the data, with queries such as the following:

- “Compute the sum of sales, grouping by city and item.”
- “Compute the sum of sales, grouping by city.”
- “Compute the sum of sales, grouping by item.”

What is the total number of cuboids, or group-by’s, that can be computed for this data cube? Taking the three attributes, city, item, and year, as the dimensions for the data cube, and sales_in_dollars as the measure, the total number of cuboids, or group-by’s, that can be computed for this data cube is $2^3 = 8$. The possible group-by’s are the following: \{(city, item, year), (city, item), (city, year), (item, year), (city), (item), (year), ()\}, where () means that the group-by is empty (i.e., the dimensions are not grouped). These group-by’s form a lattice of cuboids for the data cube, as shown in Figure 4.14. The base
**cuboid** contains all three dimensions, *city*, *item*, and *year*. It can return the total sales for any combination of the three dimensions. The **apex cuboid**, or 0-D cuboid, refers to the case where the group-by is empty. It contains the total sum of all sales. The base cuboid is the least generalized (most specific) of the cuboids. The apex cuboid is the most generalized (least specific) of the cuboids, and is often denoted as all. If we start at the apex cuboid and explore downward in the lattice, this is equivalent to drilling down within the data cube. If we start at the base cuboid and explore upward, this is akin to rolling up.

An SQL query containing no group-by, such as “compute the sum of total sales,” is a **zero-dimensional operation**. An SQL query containing one group-by, such as “compute the sum of sales, group by city,” is a **one-dimensional operation**. A cube operator on *n* dimensions is equivalent to a collection of *group by* statements, one for each subset of the *n* dimensions. Therefore, the cube operator is the *n*-dimensional generalization of the *group by* operator.

Similar to the syntax of SQL, the data cube in Example 4.1 could be defined as

```sql
define cube sales_cube [city, item, year]: sum(sales_in_dollars)
```

For a cube with *n* dimensions, there are a total of $2^n$ cuboids, including the base cuboid. A statement such as

```sql
compute cube sales_cube
```

would explicitly instruct the system to compute the sales aggregate cuboids for all of the eight subsets of the set \{*city*, *item*, *year*\}, including the empty subset. A cube computation operator was first proposed and studied by Gray et al. [GCB+97].

Online analytical processing may need to access different cuboids for different queries. Therefore, it may seem like a good idea to compute all or at least some of the cuboids in a data cube in advance. Precomputation leads to fast response time and avoids some redundant computation. Most, if not all, OLAP products resort to some degree of precomputation of multidimensional aggregates.

---

**Figure 4.14:** Lattice of cuboids, making up a 3-D data cube. Each cuboid represents a different group-by. The base cuboid contains the three dimensions *city*, *item*, and *year*. 
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A major challenge related to this precomputation, however, is that the required storage space may explode if all of the cuboids in a data cube are precomputed, especially when the cube has many dimensions. The storage requirements are even more excessive when many of the dimensions have associated concept hierarchies, each with multiple levels. This problem is referred to as the curse of dimensionality. The extent of the curse of dimensionality is illustrated below.

“How many cuboids are there in an n-dimensional data cube?” If there were no hierarchies associated with each dimension, then the total number of cuboids for an n-dimensional data cube, as we have seen above, is \(2^n\). However, in practice, many dimensions do have hierarchies. For example, the dimension time is usually not explored at only one conceptual level, such as year, but rather at multiple conceptual levels, such as in the hierarchy “day < month < quarter < year”. For an n-dimensional data cube, the total number of cuboids that can be generated (including the cuboids generated by climbing up the hierarchies along each dimension) is

\[
\text{Total number of cuboids} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (L_i + 1),
\]

where \(L_i\) is the number of levels associated with dimension \(i\). One is added to \(L_i\) in Equation (4.1) to include the virtual top level, all. (Note that generalizing to all is equivalent to the removal of the dimension.) This formula is based on the fact that, at most, one abstraction level in each dimension will appear in a cuboid. For example, the time dimension as specified above has 4 conceptual levels, or 5 if we include the virtual level all. If the cube has 10 dimensions and each dimension has 5 levels (including all), the total number of cuboids that can be generated is \(5^{10} \approx 9.8 \times 10^6\). The size of each cuboid also depends on the cardinality (i.e., number of distinct values) of each dimension. For example, if the AllElectronics branch in each city sold every item, there would be \(|\text{city} \times |\text{item}|\) tuples in the city-item group-by alone. As the number of dimensions, number of conceptual hierarchies, or cardinality increases, the storage space required for many of the group-by’s will grossly exceed the (fixed) size of the input relation.

By now, you probably realize that it is unrealistic to precompute and materialize all of the cuboids that can possibly be generated for a data cube (i.e., from a base cuboid). If there are many cuboids, and these cuboids are large in size, a more reasonable option is partial materialization, that is, to materialize only some of the possible cuboids that can be generated.

Partial Materialization: Selected Computation of Cuboids

There are three choices for data cube materialization given a base cuboid:

1. **No materialization**: Do not precompute any of the “nonbase” cuboids.
   This leads to computing expensive multidimensional aggregates on the fly, which can be extremely slow.
2. **Full materialization**: Precompute all of the cuboids. The resulting lattice of computed cuboids is referred to as the full cube. This choice typically requires huge amounts of memory space in order to store all of the precomputed cuboids.

3. **Partial materialization**: Selectively compute a proper subset of the whole set of possible cuboids. Alternatively, we may compute a subset of the cube, which contains only those cells that satisfy some user-specified criterion, such as where the tuple count of each cell is above some threshold. We will use the term *subcube* to refer to the latter case, where only some of the cells may be precomputed for various cuboids. Partial materialization represents an interesting trade-off between storage space and response time.

The partial materialization of cuboids or subcubes should consider three factors: (1) identify the subset of cuboids or subcubes to materialize; (2) exploit the materialized cuboids or subcubes during query processing; and (3) efficiently update the materialized cuboids or subcubes during load and refresh.

The selection of the subset of cuboids or subcubes to materialize should take into account the queries in the workload, their frequencies, and their accessing costs. In addition, it should consider workload characteristics, the cost for incremental updates, and the total storage requirements. The selection must also consider the broad context of physical database design, such as the generation and selection of indices. Several OLAP products have adopted heuristic approaches for cuboid and subcube selection. A popular approach is to materialize the set of cuboids on which other frequently referenced cuboids are based. Alternatively, we can compute an *iceberg cube*, which is a data cube that stores only those cube cells whose aggregate value (e.g., count) is above some minimum support threshold. Another common strategy is to materialize a *shell cube*. This involves precomputing the cuboids for only a small number of dimensions (such as 3 to 5) of a data cube. Queries on additional combinations of the dimensions can be computed on-the-fly. Because our aim in this chapter is to provide a solid introduction and overview of data warehousing for data mining, we defer our detailed discussion of cuboid selection and computation to Chapter 5, which studies various data cube computation methods in greater depth.

Once the selected cuboids have been materialized, it is important to take advantage of them during query processing. This involves several issues, such as how to determine the relevant cuboid(s) from among the candidate materialized cuboids, how to use available index structures on the materialized cuboids, and how to transform the OLAP operations onto the selected cuboid(s). These issues are discussed in Section 4.4.3 as well as in Chapter 5.

Finally, during load and refresh, the materialized cuboids should be updated efficiently. Parallelism and incremental update techniques for this operation should be explored.

### 4.4.2 Indexing OLAP Data: Bitmap Index and Join Index

To facilitate efficient data accessing, most data warehouse systems support index structures and materialized views (using cuboids). General methods to
select cuboids for materialization were discussed in the previous section. In this section, we examine how to index OLAP data by bitmap indexing and join indexing.

The bitmap indexing method is popular in OLAP products because it allows quick searching in data cubes. The bitmap index is an alternative representation of the record ID (RID) list. In the bitmap index for a given attribute, there is a distinct bit vector, $B_v$, for each value $v$ in the domain of the attribute. If the domain of a given attribute consists of $n$ values, then $n$ bits are needed for each entry in the bitmap index (i.e., there are $n$ bit vectors). If the attribute has the value $v$ for a given row in the data table, then the bit representing that value is set to 1 in the corresponding row of the bitmap index. All other bits for that row are set to 0.

Example 4.7 Bitmap indexing. In the AllElectronics data warehouse, suppose the dimension item at the top level has four values (representing item types): “home entertainment,” “computer,” “phone,” and “security.” Each value (e.g., “computer”) is represented by a bit vector in the bitmap index table for item. Suppose that the cube is stored as a relation table with 100,000 rows. Because the domain of item consists of four values, the bitmap index table requires four bit vectors (or lists), each with 100,000 bits. Figure 4.15 shows a base (data) table containing the dimensions item and city, and its mapping to bitmap index tables for each of the dimensions.

Bitmap indexing is advantageous compared to hash and tree indices. It is especially useful for low-cardinality domains because comparison, join, and aggregation operations are then reduced to bit arithmetic, which substantially reduces the processing time. Bitmap indexing leads to significant reductions in space and I/O since a string of characters can be represented by a single bit. For higher-cardinality domains, the method can be adapted using compression.
The join indexing method gained popularity from its use in relational database query processing. Traditional indexing maps the value in a given column to a list of rows having that value. In contrast, join indexing registers the joinable rows of two relations from a relational database. For example, if two relations \( R(\text{RID, } A) \) and \( S(\text{SID, } B) \) join on the attributes \( A \) and \( B \), then the join index record contains the pair \( (\text{RID, SID}) \), where \( \text{RID} \) and \( \text{SID} \) are record identifiers from the \( R \) and \( S \) relations, respectively. Hence, the join index records can identify joinable tuples without performing costly join operations. Join indexing is especially useful for maintaining the relationship between a foreign key and its matching primary keys, from the joinable relation.

The star schema model of data warehouses makes join indexing attractive for cross-table search, because the linkage between a fact table and its corresponding dimension tables comprises the foreign key of the fact table and the primary key of the dimension table. Join indexing maintains relationships between attribute values of a dimension (e.g., within a dimension table) and the corresponding rows in the fact table. Join indices may span multiple dimensions to form composite join indices. We can use join indices to identify subcubes that are of interest.

Example 4.8 Join indexing. In Example 3.4, we defined a star schema for AllElectronics of the form \( \text{sales_star}\{\text{time, item, branch, location}\} : \text{dollars_sold} = \text{sum(sales in dollars)} \). An example of a join index relationship between the sales fact table and the dimension tables for location and item is shown in Figure 4.16. For example, the “Main Street” value in the location dimension table joins with tuples T57, T238, and T884 of the sales fact table. Similarly, the “Sony-TV” value in the item dimension table joins with tuples T57 and T459 of the sales fact table. The corresponding join index tables are shown in Figure 4.17.

Suppose that there are 360 time values, 100 items, 50 branches, 30 locations, and 10 million sales tuples in the sales_star data cube. If the sales fact table has recorded sales for only 30 items, the remaining 70 items will obviously not participate in joins. If join indices are not used, additional I/Os have to be performed to bring the joining portions of the fact table and dimension tables together.

To further speed up query processing, the join indexing and bitmap indexing methods can be integrated to form bitmapped join indices.

4.4.3 Efficient Processing of OLAP Queries

The purpose of materializing cuboids and constructing OLAP index structures is to speed up query processing in data cubes. Given materialized views, query processing should proceed as follows:

\(^2\)A set of attributes in a relation schema that forms a primary key for another relation schema is called a foreign key.
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1. **Determine which operations should be performed on the available cuboids:** This involves transforming any selection, projection, roll-up (group-by), and drill-down operations specified in the query into corresponding SQL and/or OLAP operations. For example, slicing and dicing a data cube may correspond to selection and/or projection operations on a materialized cuboid.

2. **Determine to which materialized cuboid(s) the relevant operations should be applied:** This involves identifying all of the materialized cuboids that may potentially be used to answer the query, pruning the above set using knowledge of “dominance” relationships among the cuboids, estimating the costs of using the remaining materialized cuboids, and selecting the cuboid with the least cost.

**Example 4.9 OLAP query processing.** Suppose that we define a data cube for *AllElectronics* of the form “sales_cube [time, item, location]: sum(sales_in_dollars)”.

The dimension hierarchies used are “day < month < quarter < year” for time, “item_name < brand < type” for item, and “street < city < province_or_state < country” for location.

Suppose that the query to be processed is on \{brand, province_or_state\}, with the selection constant “year = 2010”. Also, suppose that there are four materialized cuboids available, as follows:

- cuboid 1: \{year, item_name, city\}
- cuboid 2: \{year, brand, country\}
- cuboid 3: \{year, brand, province_or_state\}
- cuboid 4: \{item_name, province_or_state\} where year = 2010
“Which of the above four cuboids should be selected to process the query?”

Finer-granularity data cannot be generated from coarser-granularity data. Therefore, cuboid 2 cannot be used because country is a more general concept than province_or_state. Cuboids 1, 3, and 4 can be used to process the query because (1) they have the same set or a superset of the dimensions in the query, (2) the selection clause in the query can imply the selection in the cuboid, and (3) the abstraction levels for the item and location dimensions in these cuboids are at a finer level than brand and province_or_state, respectively.

“How would the costs of each cuboid compare if used to process the query?”

It is likely that using cuboid 1 would cost the most because both item_name and city are at a lower level than the brand and province_or_state concepts specified in the query. If there are not many year values associated with items in the cube, but there are several item_names for each brand, then cuboid 3 will be smaller than cuboid 4, and thus cuboid 3 should be chosen to process the query. However, if efficient indices are available for cuboid 4, then cuboid 4 may be a better choice. Therefore, some cost-based estimation is required in order to decide which set of cuboids should be selected for query processing.

4.4.4 OLAP Server Architectures: ROLAP vs. MOLAP vs. HOLAP

Logically, OLAP servers present business users with multidimensional data from data warehouses or data marts, without concerns regarding how or where the
data are stored. However, the physical architecture and implementation of OLAP servers must consider data storage issues. Implementations of a warehouse server for OLAP processing include the following:

**Relational OLAP (ROLAP) servers:** These are the intermediate servers that stand in between a relational back-end server and client front-end tools. They use a *relational or extended-relational DBMS* to store and manage warehouse data, and OLAP middleware to support missing pieces. ROLAP servers include optimization for each DBMS back end, implementation of aggregation navigation logic, and additional tools and services. ROLAP technology tends to have greater scalability than MOLAP technology. The DSS server of Microstrategy, for example, adopts the ROLAP approach.

**Multidimensional OLAP (MOLAP) servers:** These servers support multidimensional views of data through *array-based multidimensional storage engines*. They map multidimensional views directly to data cube array structures. The advantage of using a data cube is that it allows fast indexing to precomputed summarized data. Notice that with multidimensional data stores, the storage utilization may be low if the data set is sparse. In such cases, sparse matrix compression techniques should be explored (Chapter 5).

Many MOLAP servers adopt a two-level storage representation to handle dense and sparse data sets: denser subcubes are identified and stored as array structures, whereas sparse subcubes employ compression technology for efficient storage utilization.

**Hybrid OLAP (HOLAP) servers:** The hybrid OLAP approach combines ROLAP and MOLAP technology, benefiting from the greater scalability of ROLAP and the faster computation of MOLAP. For example, a HOLAP server may allow large volumes of detail data to be stored in a relational database, while aggregations are kept in a separate MOLAP store. The Microsoft SQL Server 2000 supports a hybrid OLAP server.

**Specialized SQL servers:** To meet the growing demand of OLAP processing in relational databases, some database system vendors implement specialized SQL servers that provide advanced query language and query processing support for SQL queries over star and snowflake schemas in a read-only environment.

### Table 4.4: Single table for base and summary facts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RID</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>…</th>
<th>day</th>
<th>month</th>
<th>quarter</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>dollars_sold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>250.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>45,786.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“How are data actually stored in ROLAP and MOLAP architectures?” Let’s first look at ROLAP. As its name implies, ROLAP uses relational tables to store data for online analytical processing. Recall that the fact table associated with a base cuboid is referred to as a base fact table. The base fact table stores data at the abstraction level indicated by the join keys in the schema for the given data cube. Aggregated data can also be stored in fact tables, referred to as summary fact tables. Some summary fact tables store both base fact table data and aggregated data, as in Example 3.10. Alternatively, separate summary fact tables can be used for each level of abstraction, to store only aggregated data.

Example 4.10 A ROLAP data store. Table 4.4 shows a summary fact table that contains both base fact data and aggregated data. The schema of the table is “\{(record identifier (RID), item, . . . , day, month, quarter, year, dollars sold)\}”, where day, month, quarter, and year define the date of sales, and dollars sold is the sales amount. Consider the tuples with an RID of 1001 and 1002, respectively. The data of these tuples are at the base fact level, where the date of sales is October 15, 2010, and October 23, 2010, respectively. Consider the tuple with an RID of 5001. This tuple is at a more general level of abstraction than the tuples 1001 and 1002. The day value has been generalized to all, so that the corresponding time value is October 2010. That is, the dollars sold amount shown is an aggregation representing the entire month of October 2010, rather than just October 15 or 23, 2010. The special value all is used to represent subtotals in summarized data.

MOLAP uses multidimensional array structures to store data for online analytical processing. This structure is discussed in the following section on data warehouse implementation and, in greater detail, in Chapter 5.

Most data warehouse systems adopt a client-server architecture. A relational data store always resides at the data warehouse/data mart server site. A multidimensional data store can reside at either the database server site or the client site.

### 4.5 Data Generalization by Attribute-Oriented Induction

Conceptually, data cube can be viewed as one kind of multidimensional data generalization. In general, data generalization summarizes data by replacing relatively low-level values (such as numeric values for an attribute age) with higher-level concepts (such as young, middle-aged, and senior) or by reducing the number of dimensions to summarize data in concept space involving less number of dimensions (such as removing birth-date and telephone numbers when summarizing the behavior of a group of students). Given the large amount of data stored in databases, it is useful to be able to describe concepts in concise and succinct terms at generalized (rather than low) levels of abstraction. Allowing data sets to be generalized at multiple levels of abstrac-
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Generalization facilitates users in examining the general behavior of the data. Given the AllElectronics database, for example, instead of examining individual customer transactions, sales managers may prefer to view the data generalized to higher levels, such as summarized by customer groups according to geographic regions, frequency of purchases per group, and customer income.

This leads us to the notion of concept description, which is a form of data generalization. A concept typically refers to a collection of data such as frequent buyers, graduate students, and so on. As a data mining task, concept description is not a simple enumeration of the data. Instead, concept description generates descriptions for the characterization and comparison of the data. It is sometimes called class description, when the concept to be described refers to a class of objects. Characterization provides a concise and succinct summarization of the given collection of data, while concept or class comparison (also known as discrimination) provides descriptions comparing two or more collections of data.

Up to this point, we have studied data cube (or OLAP) approaches to concept description using multidimensional, multilevel data generalization in data warehouses. “Is data cube technology sufficient to accomplish all kinds of concept description tasks for large data sets?” Consider the following cases.

- **Complex data types and aggregation**: Data warehouses and OLAP tools are based on a multidimensional data model that views data in the form of a data cube, consisting of dimensions (or attributes) and measures (aggregate functions). However, many current OLAP systems confine dimensions to nonnumeric data and measures to numeric data. In reality, the database can include attributes of various data types, including numeric, nonnumeric, spatial, text, or image, which ideally should be included in the concept description. Furthermore, the aggregation of attributes in a database may include sophisticated data types, such as the collection of nonnumeric data, the merging of spatial regions, the composition of images, the integration of texts, and the grouping of object pointers. Therefore, OLAP, with its restrictions on the possible dimension and measure types, represents a simplified model for data analysis. Concept description should handle complex data types of the attributes and their aggregations, as necessary.

- **User-control versus automation**: Online analytical processing in data warehouses is a user-controlled process. The selection of dimensions and the application of OLAP operations, such as drill-down, roll-up, slicing, and dicing, are primarily directed and controlled by the users. Although the control in most OLAP systems is quite user-friendly, users do require a good understanding of the role of each dimension. Furthermore, in order to find a satisfactory description of the data, users may need to specify a long sequence of OLAP operations. It is often desirable to have a more automated process that helps users determine which dimensions (or attributes) should be included in the analysis, and the degree to which the given data set should be generalized in order to produce an interesting summarization of the data.
This section presents an alternative method for concept description, called *attribute-oriented induction*, which works for complex types of data and relies on a data-driven generalization process.

### 4.5.1 Attribute-Oriented Induction for Data Characterization

The *attribute-oriented induction* (AOI) approach to concept description was first proposed in 1989, a few years before the introduction of the data cube approach. The data cube approach is essentially based on *materialized views* of the data, which typically have been precomputed in a data warehouse. In general, it performs off-line aggregation before an OLAP or data mining query is submitted for processing. On the other hand, the attribute-oriented induction approach is basically a *query-oriented*, generalization-based, online data analysis technique. Note that there is no inherent barrier distinguishing the two approaches based on online aggregation versus off-line precomputation. Some aggregations in the data cube can be computed online, while off-line precomputation of multidimensional space can speed up attribute-oriented induction as well.

The general idea of attribute-oriented induction is to first collect the task-relevant data using a database query and then perform generalization based on the examination of the number of distinct values of each attribute in the relevant set of data. The generalization is performed by either *attribute removal* or *attribute generalization*. Aggregation is performed by merging identical generalized tuples and accumulating their respective counts. This reduces the size of the generalized data set. The resulting generalized relation can be mapped into different forms for presentation to the user, such as charts or rules.

The following examples illustrate the process of attribute-oriented induction. We first discuss its use for characterization. The method is extended for the mining of class comparisons in Section 4.5.3.

#### Example 4.11 A data mining query for characterization

Suppose that a user would like to describe the general characteristics of graduate students in the *Big University* database, given the attributes *name*, *gender*, *major*, *birth place*, *birth date*, *residence*, *phone#* (telephone number), and *gpa* (grade point average). A data mining query for this characterization can be expressed in the data mining query language, DMQL, as follows:

```sql
use Big_University_DB
mine characteristics as "Science_Students"
in relevance to name, gender, major, birth_place, birth_date, residence, phone#, gpa
from student
where status in "graduate"
```

We will see how this example of a typical data mining query can apply attribute-oriented induction for mining characteristic descriptions.
First, **data focusing** should be performed **before** attribute-oriented induction. This step corresponds to the specification of the task-relevant data (i.e., data for analysis). The data are collected based on the information provided in the data mining query. Because a data mining query is usually relevant to only a portion of the database, selecting the relevant set of data not only makes mining more efficient, but also derives more meaningful results than mining the entire database.

Specifying the set of relevant attributes (i.e., attributes for mining, as indicated in DMQL with the **in relevance to** clause) may be difficult for the user. A user may select only a few attributes that he or she feels may be important, while missing others that could also play a role in the description. For example, suppose that the dimension **birth place** is defined by the attributes **city**, **province or state**, and **country**. Of these attributes, let’s say that the user has only thought to specify **city**. In order to allow generalization on the **birth place** dimension, the other attributes defining this dimension should also be included. In other words, having the system automatically include **province or state** and **country** as relevant attributes allows **city** to be generalized to these higher conceptual levels during the induction process.

At the other extreme, suppose that the user may have introduced too many attributes by specifying all of the possible attributes with the clause “**in relevance to** ∗”. In this case, all of the attributes in the relation specified by the **from** clause would be included in the analysis. Many of these attributes are unlikely to contribute to an interesting description. A correlation-based (Section 3.3.2) or entropy-based (Section 3.5.6) analysis method can be used to perform attribute relevance analysis and filter out statistically irrelevant or weakly relevant attributes from the descriptive mining process. Other approaches, such as attribute subset selection, are also described in Chapter 3.

“What does the ‘**where status in** “graduate”’ clause mean?” This **where** clause implies that a concept hierarchy exists for the attribute **status**. Such a concept hierarchy organizes primitive-level data values for **status**, such as “**M.Sc.”**, “**M.A.”**, “**M.B.A.”**, “**Ph.D.”**, “**B.Sc.”**, “**B.A.”**, into higher conceptual levels, such as “**graduate**” and “**undergraduate**.” This use of concept hierarchies does not appear in traditional relational query languages, yet is likely to become a common feature in data mining query languages.

The data mining query presented above is transformed into the following relational query for the collection of the task-relevant set of data:

```sql
use Big_University_DB
select name, gender, major, birthplace, birthdate, residence, phone#, gpa
from student
where status in { "M.Sc.", "M.A.", "M.B.A.", "Ph.D." }
```

The transformed query is executed against the relational database, **Big_University_DB**, and returns the data shown in Table 4.5. This table is called the **(task-relevant) initial working relation**. It is the data on which induction will be performed. Note that each tuple is, in fact, a conjunction of attribute-value pairs. Hence,
Table 4.5: Initial working relation: a collection of task-relevant data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>major</th>
<th>birth_place</th>
<th>birth_date</th>
<th>residence</th>
<th>phone#</th>
<th>gpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Woodman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Vancouver, BC, Canada</td>
<td>8-12-76</td>
<td>3511 Main St., Richmond</td>
<td>687-4598</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Lachance</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Montreal, Que, Canada</td>
<td>28-7-75</td>
<td>345 1st Ave., Richmond</td>
<td>253-9106</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Lee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>physics</td>
<td>Seattle, WA, USA</td>
<td>25-8-70</td>
<td>125 Austin Ave., Burnaby</td>
<td>420-5232</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

we can think of a tuple within a relation as a rule of conjuncts, and of induction on the relation as the generalization of these rules.

"Now that the data are ready for attribute-oriented induction, how is attribute-oriented induction performed?" The essential operation of attribute-oriented induction is data generalization, which can be performed in either of two ways on the initial working relation: attribute removal and attribute generalization.

**Attribute removal** is based on the following rule: If there is a large set of distinct values for an attribute of the initial working relation, but either (1) there is no generalization operator on the attribute (e.g., there is no concept hierarchy defined for the attribute), or (2) its higher-level concepts are expressed in terms of other attributes, then the attribute should be removed from the working relation.

Let’s examine the reasoning behind this rule. An attribute-value pair represents a conjunct in a generalized tuple, or rule. The removal of a conjunct eliminates a constraint and thus generalizes the rule. If, as in case 1, there is a large set of distinct values for an attribute but there is no generalization operator for it, the attribute should be removed because it cannot be generalized, and preserving it would imply keeping a large number of disjuncts, which contradicts the goal of generating concise rules. On the other hand, consider case 2, where the higher-level concepts of the attribute are expressed in terms of other attributes. For example, suppose that the attribute in question is street, whose higher-level concepts are represented by the attributes ⟨city, province_or_state, country⟩. The removal of street is equivalent to the application of a generalization operator. This rule corresponds to the generalization rule known as dropping conditions in the machine learning literature on learning from examples.

**Attribute generalization** is based on the following rule: If there is a large set of distinct values for an attribute in the initial working relation, and there exists a set of generalization operators on the attribute, then a generalization operator should be selected and applied to the attribute. This rule is based on the following reasoning. Use of a generalization operator to generalize an attribute value within a tuple, or rule, in the working relation will make the rule cover more of the original data tuples, thus generalizing the concept it represents. This corresponds to the generalization rule known as climbing generalization trees in learning from examples, or concept tree ascension.

Both rules, attribute removal and attribute generalization, claim that if there
is a large set of distinct values for an attribute, further generalization should be applied. This raises the question: how large is “a large set of distinct values for an attribute” considered to be?

Depending on the attributes or application involved, a user may prefer some attributes to remain at a rather low abstraction level while others are generalized to higher levels. The control of how high an attribute should be generalized is typically quite subjective. The control of this process is called attribute generalization control. If the attribute is generalized “too high,” it may lead to overgeneralization, and the resulting rules may not be very informative. On the other hand, if the attribute is not generalized to a “sufficiently high level,” then undergeneralization may result, where the rules obtained may not be informative either. Thus, a balance should be attained in attribute-oriented generalization.

There are many possible ways to control a generalization process. We will describe two common approaches and then illustrate how they work with an example.

The first technique, called attribute generalization threshold control, either sets one generalization threshold for all of the attributes, or sets one threshold for each attribute. If the number of distinct values in an attribute is greater than the attribute threshold, further attribute removal or attribute generalization should be performed. Data mining systems typically have a default attribute threshold value generally ranging from 2 to 8 and should allow experts and users to modify the threshold values as well. If a user feels that the generalization reaches too high a level for a particular attribute, the threshold can be increased. This corresponds to drilling down along the attribute. Also, to further generalize a relation, the user can reduce the threshold of a particular attribute, which corresponds to rolling up along the attribute.

The second technique, called generalized relation threshold control, sets a threshold for the generalized relation. If the number of (distinct) tuples in the generalized relation is greater than the threshold, further generalization should be performed. Otherwise, no further generalization should be performed. Such a threshold may also be preset in the data mining system (usually within a range of 10 to 30), or set by an expert or user, and should be adjustable. For example, if a user feels that the generalized relation is too small, he or she can increase the threshold, which implies drilling down. Otherwise, to further generalize a relation, the threshold can be reduced, which implies rolling up.

These two techniques can be applied in sequence: first apply the attribute threshold control technique to generalize each attribute, and then apply relation threshold control to further reduce the size of the generalized relation. No matter which generalization control technique is applied, the user should be allowed to adjust the generalization thresholds in order to obtain interesting concept descriptions.

In many database-oriented induction processes, users are interested in obtaining quantitative or statistical information about the data at different levels of abstraction. Thus, it is important to accumulate count and other aggregate values in the induction process. Conceptually, this is performed as follows. The aggregate function, count, is associated with each database tuple. Its value for
each tuple in the initial working relation is initialized to 1. Through attribute
removal and attribute generalization, tuples within the initial working relation
may be generalized, resulting in groups of identical tuples. In this case, all
of the identical tuples forming a group should be merged into one tuple. The
count of this new, generalized tuple is set to the total number of tuples from the
initial working relation that are represented by (i.e., were merged into) the new
generalized tuple. For example, suppose that by attribute-oriented induction,
52 data tuples from the initial working relation are all generalized to the same
tuple, \( T \). That is, the generalization of these 52 tuples resulted in 52 identical
instances of tuple \( T \). These 52 identical tuples are merged to form one instance
of \( T \), whose count is set to 52. Other popular aggregate functions that could
also be associated with each tuple include \( \text{sum} \) and \( \text{avg} \). For a given generalized
tuple, \( \text{sum} \) contains the sum of the values of a given numeric attribute for the
initial working relation tuples making up the generalized tuple. Suppose that
tuple \( T \) contained \( \text{sum}(\text{units\_sold}) \) as an aggregate function. The sum value for
tuple \( T \) would then be set to the total number of units sold for each of the 52
tuples. The aggregate \( \text{avg} \) (average) is computed according to the formula,
\[ \text{avg} = \text{sum}/\text{count}. \]

Example 4.12 Attribute-oriented induction. Here we show how attribute-oriented induction
is performed on the initial working relation of Table 4.5. For each attribute
of the relation, the generalization proceeds as follows:

1. \( \text{name} \): Since there are a large number of distinct values for \( \text{name} \) and
   there is no generalization operation defined on it, this attribute is re-
   moved.

2. \( \text{gender} \): Since there are only two distinct values for \( \text{gender} \), this attribute
   is retained and no generalization is performed on it.

3. \( \text{major} \): Suppose that a concept hierarchy has been defined that allows the
   attribute \( \text{major} \) to be generalized to the values \{\( \text{arts\&science}, \text{engineering}, \text{business} \}\). Suppose also that the attribute generalization threshold is
   set to 5, and that there are more than 20 distinct values for \( \text{major} \) in the
   initial working relation. By attribute generalization and attribute gen-
   eralization control, \( \text{major} \) is therefore generalized by climbing the given
   concept hierarchy.

4. \( \text{birth\_place} \): This attribute has a large number of distinct values; therefore,
   we would like to generalize it. Suppose that a concept hierarchy exists for
   \( \text{birth\_place} \), defined as “\( \text{city} < \text{province\_or\_state} < \text{country} \)”. If the number
   of distinct values for \( \text{country} \) in the initial working relation is greater
   than the attribute generalization threshold, then \( \text{birth\_place} \) should be
   removed, because even though a generalization operator exists for it, the
   generalization threshold would not be satisfied. If instead, the number
   of distinct values for \( \text{country} \) is less than the attribute generalization
   threshold, then \( \text{birth\_place} \) should be generalized to \( \text{birth\_country} \).
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5. birth\_date: Suppose that a hierarchy exists that can generalize birth\_date to age, and age to age\_range, and that the number of age ranges (or intervals) is small with respect to the attribute generalization threshold. Generalization of birth\_date should therefore take place.

6. residence: Suppose that residence is defined by the attributes number, street, residence\_city, residence\_province_or_state, and residence\_country. Then number of distinct values for number and street will likely be very high, since these concepts are quite low level. The attributes number and street should therefore be removed, so that residence is then generalized to residence\_city, which contains fewer distinct values.

7. phone\#: As with the attribute name above, this attribute contains too many distinct values and should therefore be removed in generalization.

8. gpa: Suppose that a concept hierarchy exists for gpa that groups values for grade point average into numerical intervals like \{3.75–4.0, 3.5–3.75, . . . \}, which in turn are grouped into descriptive values, such as \{excellent, very good, . . . \}. The attribute can therefore be generalized.

The generalization process will result in groups of identical tuples. For example, the first two tuples of Table 4.5 both generalize to the same identical tuple (namely, the first tuple shown in Table 4.6). Such identical tuples are then merged into one, with their counts accumulated. This process leads to the generalized relation shown in Table 4.6.

Based on the vocabulary used in OLAP, we may view count as a measure, and the remaining attributes as dimensions. Note that aggregate functions, such as sum, may be applied to numerical attributes, like salary and sales. These attributes are referred to as measure attributes.

4.5.2 Efficient Implementation of Attribute-Oriented Induction

“How is attribute-oriented induction actually implemented?” The previous subsection provided an introduction to attribute-oriented induction. The general procedure is summarized in Figure 4.18. The efficiency of this algorithm is analyzed as follows:

- Step 1 of the algorithm is essentially a relational query to collect the task-relevant data into the working relation, W. Its processing efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>major</th>
<th>birth_country</th>
<th>age_range</th>
<th>residence_city</th>
<th>gpa</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>very good</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>25–30</td>
<td>Burnaby</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: A generalized relation obtained by attribute-oriented induction on the data of Table 4.5.
Algorithm: Attribute oriented induction. Mining generalized characteristics in a relational database given a user’s data mining request.

**Input:**
- DB, a relational database;
- DMQuery, a data mining query;
- \(a\), a list of attributes (containing attributes, \(a_i\));
- \(Gen(a_i)\), a set of concept hierarchies or generalization operators on attributes, \(a_i\);
- \(thresh(a_i)\), attribute generalization thresholds for each \(a_i\).

**Output:** \(P\), a Prime generalized relation.

**Method:**
1. \(W \leftarrow \text{prepare for generalization} (\text{DMQuery}, DB)\); // Let \(W\), the working relation, hold the task-relevant data.
2. \(\text{prepare for generalization} (W)\); // This is implemented as follows.
   (a) Scan \(W\) and collect the distinct values for each attribute, \(a_i\). (Note: If \(W\) is very large, this may be done by examining a sample of \(W\).)
   (b) For each attribute \(a_i\), determine whether \(a_i\) should be removed, and if not, compute its minimum desired level \(L_i\), based on its given or default attribute threshold, and determine the mapping-pairs \((v, v')\), where \(v\) is a distinct value of \(a_i\) in \(W\), and \(v'\) is its corresponding generalized value at level \(L_i\).
3. \(P \leftarrow \text{generalization} (W)\).
The Prime generalized relation, \(P\), is derived by replacing each value \(v\) in \(W\) by its corresponding \(v'\) in the mapping while accumulating count and computing any other aggregate values.

This step can be implemented efficiently using either of the two following variations:
   (a) For each generalized tuple, insert the tuple into a sorted prime relation \(P\) by a binary search: if the tuple is already in \(P\), simply increase its count and other aggregate values accordingly; otherwise, insert it into \(P\).
   (b) Since in most cases the number of distinct values at the prime relation level is small, the prime relation can be coded as an \(m\)-dimensional array where \(m\) is the number of attributes in \(P\), and each dimension contains the corresponding generalized attribute values. Each array element holds the corresponding count and other aggregation values, if any. The insertion of a generalized tuple is performed by measure aggregation in the corresponding array element.

Figure 4.18: Basic algorithm for attribute-oriented induction.

depends on the query processing methods used. Given the successful implementation and commercialization of database systems, this step is expected to have good performance.

- Step 2 collects statistics on the working relation. This requires scanning the relation at most once. The cost for computing the minimum desired level and determining the mapping pairs, \((v, v')\), for each attribute is dependent on the number of distinct values for each attribute and is smaller than \(|W|\), the number of tuples in the working relation. Notice it may not be necessary to scan the working relation once since if the working relation is large, a sample of such a relation will be sufficient to get statistics and determine which attributes to be generalized to certain high-level and which attributes to be removed. Moreover, such statistics may also be obtained in the process of extracting and generating working relation in Step 1.

- Step 3 derives the prime relation, \(P\). This is performed by scan each tuple in the working relation and inserting generalized tuples into \(P\). There are a total of \(|W|\) tuples in \(W\) and \(p\) tuples in \(P\). For each tuple,
Table 4.7: A generalized relation for the sales last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>sales (in million dollars)</th>
<th>count (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>computer</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>computer</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>computer</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t \] in \[ W \], we substitute its attribute values based on the derived mapping-pairs. This results in a generalized tuple, \( t' \). If variation (a) is adopted, each \( t' \) takes \( O(\log p) \) to find the location for count increment or tuple insertion. Thus the total time complexity is \( O(|W| \times \log p) \) for all of the generalized tuples. If variation (b) is adopted, each \( t' \) takes \( O(1) \) to find the tuple for count increment. Thus the overall time complexity is \( O(N) \) for all of the generalized tuples.

Many data analysis tasks need to examine a good number of dimensions or attributes. This may involve dynamically introducing and testing additional attributes rather than just those specified in the mining query. Moreover, a user with little knowledge of the truly relevant set of data may simply specify “in relevance to *” in the mining query, which includes all of the attributes into the analysis. Therefore, an advanced concept description mining process needs to perform attribute relevance analysis on large sets of attributes to select the most relevant ones. Such analysis may employ correlation or entropy measures, as described in Chapter 3 on data preprocessing.

Example 4.13 Presentation of generalization results. Suppose that attribute-oriented induction was performed on a sales relation of the AllElectronics database, resulting in the generalized description of Table 4.7 for sales last year. The description is shown in the form of a generalized relation. Table 4.6 of Example 4.11 is another example of a generalized relation.

Such generalized relations can also be presented in the form of cross tabulation forms, various kinds of graphic presentation (such as pie charts and bar charts), and quantitative characteristics rules (i.e., showing how different value combinations are distributed in the generalized relation).

4.5.3 Attribute-Oriented Induction for Class Comparisons

In many applications, users may not be interested in having a single class (or concept) described or characterized, but rather would prefer to mine a description that compares or distinguishes one class (or concept) from other comparable classes (or concepts). Class discrimination or comparison (hereafter referred to as class comparison) mines descriptions that distinguish a
target class from its contrasting classes. Notice that the target and contrasting classes must be comparable in the sense that they share similar dimensions and attributes. For example, the three classes, person, address, and item, are not comparable. However, the sales in the last three years are comparable classes, and so are computer science students versus physics students.

Our discussions on class characterization in the previous sections handle multilevel data summarization and characterization in a single class. The techniques developed can be extended to handle class comparison across several comparable classes. For example, the attribute generalization process described for class characterization can be modified so that the generalization is performed synchronously among all the classes compared. This allows the attributes in all of the classes to be generalized to the same levels of abstraction. Suppose, for instance, that we are given the AllElectronics data for sales in 2009 and sales in 2010 and would like to compare these two classes. Consider the dimension location with abstractions at the city, province or state, and country levels. Data in each class should be generalized to the same location level. That is, they are all synchronously generalized to either the city level, or the province or state level, or the country level. Ideally, this is more useful than comparing, say, the sales in Vancouver in 2009 with the sales in the United States in 2010 (i.e., where each set of sales data is generalized to a different level). The users, however, should have the option to overwrite such an automated, synchronous comparison with their own choices, when preferred.

“How is class comparison performed?” In general, the procedure is as follows:

1. **Data collection**: The set of relevant data in the database is collected by query processing and is partitioned respectively into a target class and one or a set of contrasting classes.

2. **Dimension relevance analysis**: If there are many dimensions, then dimension relevance analysis should be performed on these classes to select only the highly relevant dimensions for further analysis. Correlation or entropy-based measures can be used for this step (Chapter 3).

3. **Synchronous generalization**: Generalization is performed on the target class to the level controlled by a user- or expert-specified dimension threshold, which results in a prime target class relation. The concepts in the contrasting class(es) are generalized to the same level as those in the prime target class relation, forming the prime contrasting class(es) relation.

4. **Presentation of the derived comparison**: The resulting class comparison description can be visualized in the form of tables, graphs, and rules. This presentation usually includes a “contrasting” measure such as count% (percentage count) that reflects the comparison between the target and contrasting classes. The user can adjust the comparison description by applying drill-down, roll-up, and other OLAP operations to the target and contrasting classes, as desired.
The above discussion outlines a general algorithm for mining comparisons in databases. In comparison with characterization, the above algorithm involves synchronous generalization of the target class with the contrasting classes, so that classes are simultaneously compared at the same levels of abstraction.

The following example mines a class comparison describing the graduate students and the undergraduate students at *Big University*.

**Example 4.14 Mining a class comparison.** Suppose that you would like to compare the general properties between the graduate students and the undergraduate students at *Big University*, given the attributes *name*, *gender*, *major*, *birth_place*, *birth_date*, *residence*, phone#, and *gpa*.

This data mining task can be expressed in DMQL as follows:

```
use Big_University_DB
mine comparison as "grad_vs_undergrad_students"
in relevance to name, gender, major, birth_place, birth_date, residence,
   phone#, gpa
for "graduate_students"
   where status in "graduate"
versus "undergraduate_students"
   where status in "undergraduate"
analyze count%
from student
```

Let’s see how this typical example of a data mining query for mining comparison descriptions can be processed.

First, the query is transformed into two relational queries that collect two sets of task-relevant data: one for the *initial target class working relation*, and the other for the *initial contrasting class working relation*, as shown in Tables 4.8 and 4.9. This can also be viewed as the construction of a data cube, where the status \{graduate, undergraduate\} serves as one dimension, and the other attributes form the remaining dimensions.

Second, dimension relevance analysis can be performed, when necessary, on the two classes of data. After this analysis, irrelevant or weakly relevant dimensions, such as *name*, *gender*, *birth_place*, *residence*, and *phone#*, are removed from the resulting classes. Only the highly relevant attributes are included in the subsequent analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>major</th>
<th>birth_place</th>
<th>birth_date</th>
<th>residence</th>
<th>phone#</th>
<th>gpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jim Woodman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Vancouver, BC, Canada</td>
<td>8-12-76</td>
<td>3511 Main St., Richmond</td>
<td>657-4598</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Lachance</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Montreal, Que, Canada</td>
<td>28-7-75</td>
<td>345 1st Ave., Vancouver</td>
<td>253-9106</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Lee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Seattle, WA, USA</td>
<td>25-8-70</td>
<td>125 Austin Ave., Burnaby</td>
<td>420-5232</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: Initial working relations: the *target class* (graduate students)
Table 4.9: Initial working relations: the contrasting class (undergraduate students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>major</th>
<th>birth_place</th>
<th>birth_date</th>
<th>residence</th>
<th>phone#</th>
<th>gpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Schumann</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Calgary, Alta, Canada</td>
<td>10-1-78</td>
<td>2642 Halifax St., Burnaby</td>
<td>294-4291</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Eau</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Golden, BC, Canada</td>
<td>30-3-76</td>
<td>463 Sunset Cres., Vancouver</td>
<td>681-5417</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: Prime generalized relation for the target class (graduate students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>major</th>
<th>age_range</th>
<th>gpa</th>
<th>count%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>21...25</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>26...30</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>over_30</td>
<td>very_good</td>
<td>5.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>over_30</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, synchronous generalization is performed: Generalization is performed on the target class to the levels controlled by user- or expert-specified dimension thresholds, forming the prime target class relation. The contrasting class is generalized to the same levels as those in the prime target class relation, forming the prime contrasting class(es) relation, as presented in Tables 4.10 and 4.11. In comparison with undergraduate students, graduate students tend to be older and have a higher GPA, in general.

Finally, the resulting class comparison is presented in the form of tables, graphs, and/or rules. This visualization includes a contrasting measure (such as count%) that compares between the target class and the contrasting class. For example, 5.02% of the graduate students majoring in Science are between 26 and 30 years of age and have a “good” GPA, while only 2.32% of undergraduates have these same characteristics. Drilling and other OLAP operations may be performed on the target and contrasting classes as deemed necessary by the user in order to adjust the abstraction levels of the final description.

As shown in the above introduction to attribute-oriented induction for data characterization and generalization, attribute-oriented induction provides an

Table 4.11: Prime generalized relation for the contrasting class (undergraduate students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>major</th>
<th>age_range</th>
<th>gpa</th>
<th>count%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>16...20</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>16...20</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>4.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>26...30</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>over_30</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>0.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
alternative data generalization method in comparison with data cube approach. It is not confined to relational data since such induction can be performed on spatial, multimedia, sequence and other kinds of data sets, and there is no need to precompute a data cube since generalization can be performed online upon receiving a user’s query. Moreover, automated analysis can be added to such an induction process to automatically filter out some irrelevant or unimportant attributes and add some closed relevant ones. Analysis can also be performed to generalize the data to certain high level for further analysis. However, since attribute-oriented induction automatically generalizes data to certain high-level, it cannot efficiently support the process of drilling down to the level deeper than those provided in the generalized relation. It is desirable to integrate data cube technology with attribute-oriented induction to balance precomputation and online computation and to support fast online computation when it is necessary to drill down to the level deeper than that provided in the generalized relation.

4.6 Summary

- A data warehouse is a subject-oriented, integrated, time-variant, and nonvolatile collection of data organized in support of management decision making. Several factors distinguish data warehouses from operational databases. Because the two systems provide quite different functionalities and require different kinds of data, it is necessary to maintain data warehouses separately from operational databases.

- Data warehouses often adopt a three-tier architecture. The bottom tier is a warehouse database server, which is typically a relational database system. The middle tier is an OLAP server, and the top tier is a client, containing query and reporting tools.

- A data warehouse contains back-end tools and utilities for populating and refreshing the warehouse. These cover data extraction, data cleaning, data transformation, loading, refreshing, and warehouse management.

- Data warehouse metadata are data defining the warehouse objects. A metadata repository provides details regarding the warehouse structure, data history, the algorithms used for summarization, mappings from the source data to warehouse form, system performance, and business terms and issues.

- A multidimensional data model is typically used for the design of corporate data warehouses and departmental data marts. Such a model can adopt a star schema, snowflake schema, or fact constellation schema. The core of the multidimensional model is the data cube, which consists of a large set of facts (or measures) and a number of dimensions. Dimensions are the entities or perspectives with respect to which an organization wants to keep records and are hierarchical in nature.
• A data cube consists of a lattice of cuboids, each corresponding to a different degree of summarization of the given multidimensional data.

• Concept hierarchies organize the values of attributes or dimensions into gradual levels of abstraction. They are useful in mining at multiple levels of abstraction.

• Online analytical processing (OLAP) can be performed in data warehouses/marts using the multidimensional data model. Typical OLAP operations include roll-up, drill-down, across, through), slice-and-dice, pivot (rotate), as well as statistical operations such as ranking and computing moving averages and growth rates. OLAP operations can be implemented efficiently using the data cube structure.

• Data warehouses are used for information processing (querying and reporting), analytical processing (which allows users to navigate through summarized and detailed data by OLAP operations), and data mining (which supports knowledge discovery). OLAP-based data mining is referred to as multidimensional data mining (also known as exploratory multidimensional data mining, online analytical mining, or OLAM). It emphasizes the interactive and exploratory nature of data mining.

• OLAP servers may adopt a relational OLAP (ROLAP), a multidimensional OLAP (MOLAP), or a hybrid OLAP (HOLAP) implementation. A ROLAP server uses an extended relational DBMS that maps OLAP operations on multidimensional data to standard relational operations. A MOLAP server maps multidimensional data views directly to array structures. A HOLAP server combines ROLAP and MOLAP. For example, it may use ROLAP for historical data while maintaining frequently accessed data in a separate MOLAP store.

• Full materialization refers to the computation of all of the cuboids in the lattice defining a data cube. It typically requires an excessive amount of storage space, particularly as the number of dimensions and size of associated concept hierarchies grow. This problem is known as the curse of dimensionality. Alternatively, partial materialization is the selective computation of a subset of the cuboids or subcubes in the lattice. For example, an iceberg cube is a data cube that stores only those cube cells whose aggregate value (e.g., count) is above some minimum support threshold.

• OLAP query processing can be made more efficient with the use of indexing techniques. In bitmap indexing, each attribute has its own bitmap index table. Bitmap indexing reduces join, aggregation, and comparison operations to bit arithmetic. Join indexing registers the joinable rows of two or more relations from a relational database, reducing the overall cost of OLAP join operations. Bitmapped join indexing, which combines the bitmap and join index methods, can be used to further speed up OLAP query processing.
Data generalization is a process that abstracts a large set of task-relevant data in a database from a relatively low conceptual level to higher conceptual levels. Data generalization approaches include data cube-based data aggregation and attribute-oriented induction. Item Concept description is the most basic form of descriptive data mining. It describes a given set of task-relevant data in a concise and summarative manner, presenting interesting general properties of the data. Concept (or class) description consists of characterization and comparison (or discrimination). The former summarizes and describes a collection of data, called the target class, whereas the latter summarizes and distinguishes one collection of data, called the target class, from other collection(s) of data, collectively called the contrasting class(es).

Concept characterization can be implemented using data cube (OLAP-based) approaches and the attribute-oriented induction approach. These are attribute- or dimension-based generalization approaches. The attribute-oriented induction approach consists of the following techniques: data focusing, data generalization by attribute removal or attribute generalization, count and aggregate value accumulation, attribute generalization control, and generalization data visualization.

Concept comparison can be performed using the attribute-oriented induction or data cube approaches in a manner similar to concept characterization. Generalized tuples from the target and contrasting classes can be quantitatively compared and contrasted.

4.7 Exercises

1. State why, for the integration of multiple heterogeneous information sources, many companies in industry prefer the update-driven approach (which constructs and uses data warehouses), rather than the query-driven approach (which applies wrappers and integrators). Describe situations where the query-driven approach is preferable over the update-driven approach.

2. Briefly compare the following concepts. You may use an example to explain your point(s).
   (a) Snowflake schema, fact constellation, starnet query model
   (b) Data cleaning, data transformation, refresh
   (c) Discovery-driven cube, multifeature cube, virtual warehouse

3. Suppose that a data warehouse consists of the three dimensions time, doctor, and patient, and the two measures count and charge, where charge is the fee that a doctor charges a patient for a visit.
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(a) Enumerate three classes of schemas that are popularly used for modeling data warehouses.

(b) Draw a schema diagram for the above data warehouse using one of the schema classes listed in (a).

(c) Starting with the base cuboid \([day, doctor, patient]\), what specific \textit{OLAP operations} should be performed in order to list the total fee collected by each doctor in 2004?

(d) To obtain the same list, write an SQL query assuming the data is stored in a relational database with the schema \textit{fee} \((day, month, year, doctor, hospital, patient, count, charge)\).

4. Suppose that a data warehouse for \textit{Big-University} consists of the following four dimensions: \textit{student}, \textit{course}, \textit{semester}, and \textit{instructor}, and two measures \textit{count} and \textit{avg\_grade}. When at the lowest conceptual level (e.g., for a given student, course, semester, and instructor combination), the \textit{avg\_grade} measure stores the actual course grade of the student. At higher conceptual levels, \textit{avg\_grade} stores the average grade for the given combination.

(a) Draw a \textit{snowflake schema} diagram for the data warehouse.

(b) Starting with the base cuboid \([\textit{student, course, semester, instructor}]\), what specific \textit{OLAP operations} (e.g., roll-up from \textit{semester} to \textit{year}) should one perform in order to list the average grade of \textit{CS} courses for each \textit{Big-University} student.

(c) If each dimension has five levels (including \textit{all}), such as “\textit{student < major < status < university < all}”, how many cuboids will this cube contain (including the base and apex cuboids)?

5. Suppose that a data warehouse consists of the four dimensions, \textit{date}, \textit{spectator}, \textit{location}, and \textit{game}, and the two measures, \textit{count} and \textit{charge}, where \textit{charge} is the fare that a spectator pays when watching a game on a given date. Spectators may be students, adults, or seniors, with each category having its own charge rate.

(a) Draw a \textit{star schema} diagram for the data warehouse.

(b) Starting with the base cuboid \([\textit{date, spectator, location, game}]\), what specific \textit{OLAP operations} should one perform in order to list the total charge paid by student spectators at \textit{GM\_Place} in 2004?

(c) \textit{Bitmap indexing} is useful in data warehousing. Taking this cube as an example, briefly discuss advantages and problems of using a bitmap index structure.

6. A data warehouse can be modeled by either a \textit{star schema} or a \textit{snowflake schema}. Briefly describe the similarities and the differences of the two
models, and then analyze their advantages and disadvantages with regard to one another. Give your opinion of which might be more empirically useful and state the reasons behind your answer.

7. Design a data warehouse for a regional weather bureau. The weather bureau has about 1,000 probes, which are scattered throughout various land and ocean locations in the region to collect basic weather data, including air pressure, temperature, and precipitation at each hour. All data are sent to the central station, which has collected such data for over 10 years. Your design should facilitate efficient querying and on-line analytical processing, and derive general weather patterns in multidimensional space.

8. A popular data warehouse implementation is to construct a multidimensional database, known as a data cube. Unfortunately, this may often generate a huge, yet very sparse multidimensional matrix.

(a) Present an example illustrating such a huge and sparse data cube.

(b) Design an implementation method that can elegantly overcome this sparse matrix problem. Note that you need to explain your data structures in detail and discuss the space needed, as well as how to retrieve data from your structures.

(c) Modify your design in (b) to handle incremental data updates. Give the reasoning behind your new design.

9. Regarding the computation of measures in a data cube:

(a) Enumerate three categories of measures, based on the kind of aggregate functions used in computing a data cube.

(b) For a data cube with the three dimensions time, location, and item, which category does the function variance belong to? Describe how to compute it if the cube is partitioned into many chunks.

\[ \text{Hint: The formula for computing variance is } \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (x_i - \bar{x})^2,\]

where \( \bar{x} \) is the average of \( x_i \)'s.

(c) Suppose the function is “top 10 sales.” Discuss how to efficiently compute this measure in a data cube.

10. Suppose a company would like to design a data warehouse that may facilitate the analysis of moving vehicles in an online analytical processing manner. The company registers huge amounts of auto movement data in the format of (AutoID, location, speed, time). Each AutoID represents one vehicle associated with information, such as vehicle category, driver category, etc., and each location could be associated with a street in a city. You may assume a street map is available for the city.

(a) Design such a data warehouse that may facilitate effective on-line analytical processing in multidimensional space.
(b) The movement data may contain noise. Discuss how you can develop a method that may automatically discover some data records are likely erroneously registered in the data repository.

(c) The movement data may be sparse. Discuss how you can develop a method that may construct reliable data warehouse despite of the sparsity of data.

(d) If one wants to drive from A to B starting at a particular time, discuss how a system may use the data in this warehouse to work out a fast route for the driver.

11. RFID has been used substantially to trace object movements and perform inventory control. An RFID reader can successfully read an RFID tag at certain limited distance at any scheduled time. Suppose a company would like to design a data warehouse that may facilitate the analysis of objects with RFID tags in an online analytical processing manner. The company registers huge amounts of RFID data in the format of (RFID, at-location, time), and also has some information about the objects carrying the RFID tag, e.g., (RFID, product-name, product-category, producer, produced-date, price).

(a) Design a data warehouse that may facilitate effective registration and on-line analytical processing of such data.

(b) The RFID data may contain lots of redundant information. Discuss one method that maximally reduces redundancy in the registration of them in the RFID data warehouse.

(c) The RFID data may contain lots of noises, such as missing registration, misreading of IDs. Discuss one method that clean-up the noise data effectively in the RFID data warehouse.

(d) One may like to perform online analytical processing to find how many TV sets shipping from the LA seaport to BestBuy in Champaign by month, by brand, and by price-range. Outline how this can be done efficiently if you store such RFID data in the warehouse.

(e) If a customer brings back a jug of milk and complains it is rotten before its expiration data, discuss how you could investigate such a case in the warehouse to find out what could be the problem, in shipping or in storage.

12. In many applications, new data sets are incrementally added to the existing large data sets. Thus an important consideration is whether a measure can be computed efficiently in incremental manner. Use count, standard deviation, and median as examples to show that a distributive or algebraic measure facilitates efficient incremental computation, whereas a holistic measure does not.

13. Suppose that we need to record three measures in a data cube: \( \text{min} \), \( \text{average} \), and \( \text{median} \). Design an efficient computation and storage method for
each measure given that the cube allows data to be deleted incrementally (i.e., in small portions at a time) from the cube.

14. In data warehouse technology, a multiple dimensional view can be implemented by a relational database technique (ROLAP), or by a multidimensional database technique (MOLAP), or by a hybrid database technique (HOLAP).

(a) Briefly describe each implementation technique.

(b) For each technique, explain how each of the following functions may be implemented:
   i. The generation of a data warehouse (including aggregation)
   ii. Roll-up
   iii. Drill-down
   iv. Incremental updating

Which implementation techniques do you prefer, and why?

15. Suppose that a data warehouse contains 20 dimensions, each with about five levels of granularity.

   (a) Users are mainly interested in four particular dimensions, each having three frequently accessed levels for rolling up and drilling down. How would you design a data cube structure to support this preference efficiently?

   (b) At times, a user may want to drill through the cube, down to the raw data for one or two particular dimensions. How would you support this feature?

16. A data cube, \( C \), has \( n \) dimensions, and each dimension has exactly \( p \) distinct values in the base cuboid. Assume that there are no concept hierarchies associated with the dimensions.

   (a) What is the maximum number of cells possible in the base cuboid?

   (b) What is the minimum number of cells possible in the base cuboid?

   (c) What is the maximum number of cells possible (including both base cells and aggregate cells) in the data cube, \( C \)?

   (d) What is the minimum number of cells possible in the data cube, \( C \)?

17. What are the differences between the three main types of data warehouse usage: information processing, analytical processing, and data mining? Discuss the motivation behind OLAP mining (OLAM).
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