BEDB^m Advanced SQL II

Lætitia Avrot

© EnterpriseDB Corporation 2023 - All Rights Reserved



Lætitia Avrot



- Field CTO EDB
- PostgreSQL Europe Treasurer
- Postgres Women Founder
- Recognized contributor to the PostgreSQL project

Summary of previous episodes



SQL is...



- Turing-complete
- Unknown
- Based originally on relational algebra



NULL is not...

 $\mathbb{N}ULL.$

)B

- Marks there is no value
- Exists for all datatypes

- An empty string
- A string with spaces
- The string 'NULL'

Quizz!



How many kind of joins do exist in SQL?



There are 7 kinds of joins: Inner join Left or right outer join Full outer join Cartesian product Natural join Lateral join Anti join



Do we need to add a group by to this query?

select

name, avg(salary) from employeeHistory



select name, avg(salary) from employeeHistory

group by name

Group by is not implicit in SQL. You can always group on more columns than the one listed in the select. You can't omit one of the non aggregated columns from the select in the group by.



How can we filter an aggregate result?

- In the where clause
- In the select clause
- In the having clause
- All of the above



select
 name,
 avg(salary)
from employeeHistory
group by name
having avg(salary) < 10000</pre>

Having was invented for that purpose. It is the simplest way of filtering an aggregation result.



```
With avgSalary(name, avgSalary) as (
  select
    name,
    avg(salary)
  from employeeHistory
  group by name
select *
from avgSalary
where avgSalary < 10000
```

A little overcomplicated, but doable.



```
with avgSalary(name, avgSalary) as (
  select
    name,
    avg(salary)
  from employeeHistory
  group by name
select name filter (where avgSalary < 10000),
  avgSalary (where avgSalary < 10000)
from avgSalary
```



Way too complicated.

How can you create an auto incremented column in PostgreSQL?

- Manually with a sequence
- Automatically with a sequence and a default value
- Automatically with the serial datatype
- Automatically with a generated column
- All of the above

```
laetitia=# create table test(id integer primary
key, value text);
CREATE TABLE
laetitia=# create sequence my seq;
CREATE SEQUENCE
laetitia=# insert into test (select
nextval('my seq'), 'blabla');
INSERT 0 1
```

Manually with a sequence

```
laetitia=# create sequence my seq;
CREATE SEQUENCE
laetitia=# create table test (id integer
default nextval('my_seq') primary key,
 value text);
CREATE TABLE
laetitia=# insert into test(value) values
('blabla');
INSERT 0 1
```

EDB Automatically with a sequence and a default value

```
laetitia=# create table test (id serial primary
key, value text);
CREATE TABLE
laetitia=# insert into test (value) values
('blabla');
INSERT 0 1
```

Automatically with the serial datatype

id | integer | | not null | generated by default as identity
value | text | | | |
Indexes:

```
"test_pkey" PRIMARY KEY, btree (id)
```

```
laetitia=# insert into test (value) values ('blabla');
INSERT 0 1
```

Automatically with a generated column

laetitia=# insert into test (id, value) values
(2,'blabla');

ERROR: cannot insert a non-DEFAULT value into column "id" DETAIL: Column "id" is an identity column defined as GENERATED ALWAYS.

HINT: Use OVERRIDING SYSTEM VALUE to override.

EDB

A bonus from generated columns

	Sequence	Serial	Identity column
Nextval automatically as default value	No	Yes	Yes
Not null constraint	No	Yes	Yes
Prevent manual inserts	No	No	With always



Why should you use CTEs (Common Table Expressions)?

- To show off in front of developers
- To make your code more readable
- To confuse the optimiser
- All of the above



with CTEName1 (list of CTE columns) as (...), CTEName2 (list of CTE columns) as (...

Select columnsName
From CTEName2





Not in is often faster than Not exist

TrueFalse



select surname, firstname from members where memid not in select memid from bookings





```
select surname,
  firstname
from members
where memid not exist
   select 1
  from bookings
   where members.memid = bookings.memid
```



Not exist example

What is the difference between cube and rollup?

- Rollup is hierarchic while
 Cube takes a combination
 of all columns
- Cube, contrary to Rollup, needs a grouping set
- Cube has not real use case, contrary to Rollup
- All of the above



Rollup allows hierarchic aggregations, so that not all combinations of columns will be displayed.

Cube will calculate the aggregation for all possible combinations of the columns.



select

coalesce (department, 'All Departments') as Department, coalesce (gender,'All Genders') as Gender, sum(salary) as Salary_Sum from employee Group by rollup (department, gender)



Department	Gender	Salary_Sum
Finance	Female	11800
Finance	Male	5000
Finance	All Genders	16800
HR	Female	6000
HR	Male	14200
HR	All Genders	20200
All Departments	All Genders	37000



select

coalesce (department, 'All Departments') as Department, coalesce (gender,'All Genders') as Gender, sum(salary) as Salary_Sum from employee Group by cube (department, gender)



Row No	Department	Gender	Salary_Sum
1	Finance	Female	11800
2	HR	Female	6000
5	All Departments	Female	<mark>17800</mark>
6	Finance	Male	5000
7	HR	Male	14200
10	All Departments	Male	19200
11	All Departments	All Genders	37000



Some resources

(To get better in SQL)

- <u>https://mystery.knightlab.com/</u>
- <u>https://pgexercises.com/</u>
- https://modern-sql.com/
- <u>https://theartofpostgresql.com/</u>



Thank you!

42

- All Rights Reserved

© EnterpriseDB Corporation 2023

(III) ED