ERD

1. Are the **attributes for each entity in the ERD** same as that described in the database outline?

   Under the pokemon_traits entity the attribute stats should have the six attributes which compose it (hp, attack, etc.). The species attribute of the Pokémon entity is a bit confusing to me. I'm not sure if your intention is to have species be a number without any description. If that is the intention then the ERD is correct, but if not, species could be its own entity with an id attribute and type attribute where the relationship is each Pokémon belongs to one species and a species has many Pokémon. Or species could be a word like trainer_type. Times_pokemon_used is that all of that trainer's Pokémon or how many times a specific Pokémon has been used?

2. Is the **participation** of entities in the **relationships** same as that described in the outline?

   All the connectors are bold which might indicate total participation, but bold lines are also connecting the attributes and total participation connectors should be 4x the weight of a normal line so this could indicate partial participation. I cannot review this part because it is unclear what the connectors represent. Refer to the symbolkey pdf in week 3 for how to represent connectors clearly.

3. Is the **cardinality** of entities in the **relationships** same as that described in the outline?

   The relationship between region and Pokémon needs to be clarified. You have from as a one-to-many relationship but then live as a many-to-many relationship. I'm not quite sure why live is included since your database seems to use from. Evolution is listed under relationship, but it is an attribute, so no relationship exists. I would suggest going back over the changes you made after the last peer review and making sure they are represented everywhere in your document because there is information which does not line up. Pokémon and trainer relationship are described as many-to-many but shown as many-to-one in the ERD.

4. Is there something that could be changed/improved in the E R Diagram and/or the overall database design?

   All suggestions are in above answers.

Schema

1. Are the **relationship tables** present where required and correctly defined, when compared with the database outline?

Since Pokémon and trait and trainers is a many-to-many relationship, it would be clearer if you had two has relationship tables: one for trainer and Pokémon and one for traits and Pokémon.

2. Are **foreign keys** present where required and correctly defined, when compared with the database outline?

   It's not clear why there is an arrow on the Pokémon id_number attribute which points to itself. The rest appear correct, but the lines overlap and are not as clear as they should be. Look at the symbol key pdf for what to do when lines overlap.

3. Do the entity **attributes** match those described in the outline?

   Stats should be divided into its composite attributes.

4. Is there something that could be changed/improved in the Schema and/or the overall database design?

   The Pokémon and prominent trainer relationship is confusing especially with the trainer name attribute of Pokémon. If like the ERD suggests a Pokémon has one prominent trainer then change the trainer name attribute of Pokémon to the prominent trainer ID. Then the has relationship table will show all trainers of the Pokémon and the number_owned attribute of prominent trainer can be derived from the has table. I think the main thing is clarifying if a Pokémon has multiple trainers but only one prominent trainer.

DDQ file

1. Is the SQL file **syntactically correct?** This can be easily verified by importing/copy-pasting it in phpmyadmin. (*Do not forget to take backup of your own database before you do this!*)

   Yes

2. Are the **data types appropriate** considering the description of the attribute in the database outline?

   I believe the n in int(n) data type represents the number of digits not the max integer number.

3. Are the **foreign keys correctly defined** when compared to the Schema?

   There are no relationship tables which would contain the foreign keys.

4. Are **relationship tables** present when compared to the ERD/Schema?

No, none of the relationship tables are present