# Introduction to SQL Understanding HAVING versus WHERE 

## The Basics

The key difference between HAVING and WHERE is the level at which filtering takes place.

- Filtering from WHERE takes place before aggregation occurs and is applied at the base record level.
- Filtering from HAVING takes place after aggregation and is applied to the aggregated data.


## Sample Data

For this example we'll use a set of dummy data from a company specializing in winter hiking gear. Our table is called Raw_Invoices and includes the following row:

| InvoiceDate | InvoiceNumber | Brand | ItemDescription | Qty | PaidAmt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/1/2020 | 362559 | COATS | Mountaineer HD | 1 | 227.45 |
| 10/1/2020 | 302225 | SOCKS | Thermal Toasty Toes | 1 | 22.99 |
| 10/2/2020 | 362561 | SCARVES | Cozy Cravat (electric) | 1 | 110.00 |
| 10/3/2020 | 483277 | PANTS | Deluxe Polar Pants | 1 | 138.55 |
| 10/3/2020 | 362563 | GLOVES | Condor Shur-grip | 1 | 52.15 |
| 10/4/2020 | 483278 | ACCESORY | Window decal | 1 | 3.50 |
| 10/5/2020 | 362564 | SCARVES | Cozy Cravat (electric) | 1 | 110.00 |
| 10/6/2020 | 302226 | PANTS | Deluxe Polar Pants | 2 | 277.10 |
| 10/6/2020 | 362566 | SCARVES | Cozy Cravat (electric) | 1 | 110.00 |
| 10/7/2020 | 483279 | SOCKS | Thermal Toasty Toes | 2 | 45.98 |
| 10/9/2020 | 362568 | SOCKS | Thermal Toasty Toes | 1 | 22.99 |
| 10/9/2020 | 362569 | PANTS | Deluxe Polar Pants | 1 | 138.55 |
| 10/9/2020 | 483280 | COATS | Mountaineer HD | 1 | 227.45 |
| 10/10/2020 | 362571 | GLOVES | Condor Shur-grip | 1 | 52.15 |
| 10/10/2020 | 302227 | ACCESORY | Window decal | 1 | 3.50 |
| 10/11/2020 | 362572 | SOCKS | Thermal Toasty Toes | 1 | 22.99 |
| 10/12/2020 | 362573 | COATS | Mountaineer HD | 1 | 227.45 |
| 10/13/2020 | 362574 | SCARVES | Cozy Cravat (electric) | 1 | 110.00 |
| 10/14/2020 | 362575 | GLOVES | Condor Shur-grip | 2 | 104.30 |
| 10/14/2020 | 362576 | COATS | Mountaineer HD | 1 | 227.45 |
| 10/14/2020 | 483281 | ACCESORY | Window decal | 1 | 3.50 |
| 10/17/2020 | 362577 | GLOVES | Condor Shur-grip | 1 | 52.15 |
| 10/17/2020 | 362578 | GLOVES | Condor Shur-grip | 1 | 52.15 |
| 10/18/2020 | 362579 | COATS | Mountaineer HD | 1 | 227.45 |
| 10/22/2020 | 362580 | SOCKS | Thermal Toasty Toes | 2 | 45.98 |
| 10/23/2020 | 483282 | ACCESORY | Window decal | 1 | 3.50 |
| 10/24/2020 | 302229 | GLOVES | Condor Shur-grip | 2 | 104.30 |
| 10/24/2020 | 302230 | ACCESORY | Window decal | 1 | 3.50 |
| 10/27/2020 | 362582 | COATS | Mountaineer HD | 1 | 227.45 |
| 10/30/2020 | 362583 | GLOVES | Condor Shur-grip | 2 | 104.30 |

## The Business Question

Our stakeholder in the product management department would like us to produce a short summary of sales in October. Their request includes a business rule: exclude any brands which sell less than $\$ 100$ during the month.

This should filter out low-dollar items, such as the ACCESORY category, which will be handled in other reporting.

## The Dangerous Query

Here's the first query we're going to try:

```
SELECT Brand, Sum(Qty) AS Total_Qty, Sum(PaidAmt) AS Total_Paid
FROM SalesTransactions (nolock)
WHERE PaidAmt >= }10
GROUP BY Brand
ORDER BY Brand
```

Not just bad, but dangerous. Why? Because it actually returns results that look valid, but they're quite incorrect:

|  | Brand | Total_Qty | Total_Paid |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | COATS | 6 | 1364.70 |
| 2 | GLOVES | 6 | 312.90 |
| 3 | PANTS | 4 | 554.20 |
| 4 | SCARVES | 4 | 440.00 |

Since we're only talking about 30 records, let's copy the data to Excel and whip up a quick pivot:

| Row Labels $\overline{\boldsymbol{T}}$ | Sum of PaidAmt |
| :--- | ---: |
| COATS | $1,364.70$ |
| GLOVES | 521.50 |
| PANTS | 554.20 |
| SCARVES | 440.00 |
| SOCKS | 160.93 |
| ACCESORY | 17.50 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{3 , 0 5 8 . 8 3}$ |

Our query came up with the right answer for Coats, Pants, and Scarves. It excluded Accessory, as intended, since our total in that brand was less than $\$ 100$ for the time period. But the total for Gloves is incorrect, and the Socks brand is missing entirely.

What gives?

The problem is that the WHERE condition, PaidAmt $>=100$, is applied at the record level before any aggregation occurs.

Looking back at our practice data, every record with a sale of Accessories or Socks is filtered out because no single invoice includes a PaidAmt of $\$ 100$ or more.

Our sales of Gloves are a bit more of a problem. An invoice for a single pair goes for $\$ 52.15$, while an invoice where two pair were bought has a paid amount of $\$ 104.30$. Thus, single pair purchases are filtered out but purchases of two pair are included in the aggregation.

Since the Coats, Pants, and Scarves are correct, and the Gloves look like they could be correct, this is a dangerous query. Without scrutiny the information appears accurate and could lead to misguided decisions.

## The Correct Query

Here's the correct query. The business rule of a minimum $\$ 100$ threshold for the Brand is applied to the aggregated data, via HAVING.

```
SELECT Brand, Sum(Qty) AS Total_Qty, Sum(PaidAmt) AS Total_Paid
FROM SalesTransactions (nolock)
GROUP BY Brand HAVING Sum(PaidAmt) >= 100
ORDER BY Brand
```

And the results:

|  | Brand | Total_Qty | Total_Paid |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | COATS | 6 | 1364.70 |
| 2 | GLOVES | 10 | 521.50 |
| 3 | PANTS | 4 | 554.20 |
| 4 | SCARVES | 4 | 440.00 |
| 5 | SOCKS | 7 | 160.93 |

## In Conclusion

As the smartest man at Microsoft was fond of saying, "I'd rather have no data than bad data." Bad data leads to bad information, which leads to bad decisions.

Simple rule: WHERE applies before aggregating, HAVING applies after aggregating.

And no matter how confident you are in your coding skills, an understanding of the business is essential for reviewing a report and realizing that something simply doesn't look right. Significant errors don't always result in error messages.
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