Design Issues

Entities vs. Attributes

- Use of entity sets vs. attributes



- Use of phone as an entity allows extra information about phone numbers (plus multiple phone numbers)

Entities vs. Relationship sets

- **Use of entity sets vs. relationship sets**

  Possible guideline is to designate a relationship set to describe an action that occurs between entities



- **Placement of relationship attributes**

  For example, attribute date as attribute of advisor or as attribute of student

Binary Vs. Non-Binary Relationships

- Although it is possible to replace any non-binary (*n*-ary, for $n > 2$) relationship set by a number of distinct binary relationship sets, a *n*-ary relationship set shows more clearly that several entities participate in a single relationship.
- Some relationships that appear to be non-binary may be better represented using binary relationships
  - For example, a ternary relationship *parents*, relating a child to his/her father and mother, is best replaced by two binary relationships, *father* and *mother*
    - Using two binary relationships allows partial information (e.g., only mother being known)
  - But there are some relationships that are naturally non-binary
    - Example: *proj_guide*

Converting Non-Binary Relationships to Binary Form

- In general, any non-binary relationship can be represented using binary relationships by creating an artificial entity set.
  - Replace R between entity sets A, B and C by an entity set E, and three relationship sets:

    1. R_A, relating E and A
    2. R_B, relating E and B
    3. R_C, relating E and C

  - Create an identifying attribute for E *and* add any attributes of R to E
  - For each relationship (a_i , b_i , c_i) in R, create

    1. a new entity e_i in the entity set E
    2. add (e_i , a_i) to R_A
    3. add (e_i , b_i) to R_B
    4. add (e_i , c_i) to R_C



(a)



(b)

Converting Non-Binary Relationships (Cont.)

- Also need to translate constraints
  - Translating all constraints may not be possible
  - There may be instances in the translated schema that cannot correspond to any instance of *R*
    - Exercise: *add constraints to the relationships* R_A, R_B *and* R_C to ensure that a newly created entity corresponds to exactly one entity in each of entity sets *A, B* and *C*
  - We can avoid creating an identifying attribute by making E a weak entity set (described shortly) identified by the three relationship sets

E-R Design Decisions

- The use of an attribute or entity set to represent an object.
- Whether a real-world concept is best expressed by an entity set or a relationship set.
- The use of a ternary relationship versus a pair of binary relationships.
- The use of a strong or weak entity set.
- The use of specialization/generalization – contributes to modularity in the design.
- The use of aggregation – can treat the aggregate entity set as a single unit without concern for the details of its internal structure.

Summary of Symbols Used in E-R Notation



entity set



relationship set

identifying relationship set for weak entity set



total participation of entity set in relationship



attributes:
simple (A1),
composite (A2) and
multivalued (A3)
derived (A4)



primary key



discriminating attribute of weak entity set

Symbols Used in E-R Notation (Cont.)



many-to-many relationship



many-to-one relationship



one-to-one relationship



cardinality limits



role indicator



ISA: generalization or specialization



total (disjoint) generalization



disjoint generalization

Alternative ER Notations

- Chen, IDE1FX, …

entity set E with
simple attribute A1,
composite attribute A2,
multivalued attribute A3,
derived attribute A4,
and primary key A1



weak entity set 

generalization 

total generalization 

Alternative ER Notations



UML

- **UML**: Unified Modeling Language
- UML has many components to graphically model different aspects of an entire software system
- UML Class Diagrams correspond to E-R Diagram, but several differences.

ER vs. UML Class Diagrams

ER Diagram Notation

Equivalent in UML



entity with attributes (simple, composite, multivalued, derived)



class with simple attributes and methods (attribute prefixes: + = public, – = private, # = protected)



binary relationship





relationship attributes





cardinality constraints



*Note reversal of position in cardinality constraint depiction

ER vs. UML Class Diagrams

ER Diagram Notation

Equivalent in UML



*Generalization can use merged or separate arrows independent of disjoint/overlapping

UML Class Diagrams (Cont.)

- Binary relationship sets are represented in UML by just drawing a line connecting the entity sets. The relationship set name is written adjacent to the line.
- The role played by an entity set in a relationship set may also be specified by writing the role name on the line, adjacent to the entity set.
- The relationship set name may alternatively be written in a box, along with attributes of the relationship set, and the box is connected, using a dotted line, to the line depicting the relationship set.