

Database Systems I

CMPT 354 Summer 2024

Zhengjie Miao

Announcement

- RA mini tutorial There is an another radb syntax sheet
 - Be careful with rename
 - All queries are transient except view definition
- Will release Assignment 2 May 26 midnight
 - Due Jun 7
 - Slightly reduced the workload
 - Only need to setup PostgreSQL SQL lectures
 - Web interface will also be available

Summary of E/R concepts

- Entity sets
 - Keys
 - Weak entity sets
- Relationship sets
 - Attributes of relationships
 - Multiplicity
 - Roles
 - Binary versus n -ary relationships
 - Modeling n -ary relationships with weak entity sets and binary relationships
 - ISA relationships

Outline


- E/R Diagram Design Cases
- E/R – Relational Model Translation

Case study 1

- Design a database representing cities, counties, and states
 - For each state, record name and capital (city)
 - For each county, record name, acreage, and state it's in
 - For each city, record name, population, and county/state it belongs to
- Assume the following:
 - Names of states are unique
 - Names of counties are only unique within a state
 - Names of cities are only unique within a county
 - A city is always in a single county Multiple cities in a county?
 - A county is always in a single state


City = capitol city

Case study 1: first design



Since we can have multiple cities in one county, we are storing the acreage multiple times


Case study 1: first design




- County acreage information is repeated for every city in the county
 - ☞ Redundancy is bad (why?)
- State capital should really be a city
 - ☞ Should “reference” entities through explicit relationships

If you do not make the updates to the county information consistent amongst all records with this information, you could be working with incorrect data

Case study 1: second design



Case study 1: second design




- Technically, nothing in this design prevents a city in state *X* from being the capital of another state *Y*, but oh well...

Ask professor to clarify how this design can allow it

General steps

1. Recognize entity sets
2. Recognize relationship sets and participating entity sets
3. Recognize attributes of entity and relationship sets
4. Define relationship types and existence dependencies
5. Define general cardinality constraints and keys
6. Draw diagram

Case study 1: second design



Make sure design does not have arbitrary constraints

Design a database representing cities, counties, and states

- For each **state**, record **name** and **capital** (city)
- For each **county**, record **name**, **acreage**, and state it's in
- For each **city**, record name, population, and county/state it belongs to

Assume the following:

- Names of states are **unique**
- Names of counties are only **unique within a state**
- Names of cities are only **unique within a county**
- A city is always in a single county
- A county is always in a single state

Case study 2




- Design a database consistent with the following:
 - A station has a unique name and an address, and is either an express station or a local station
 - A train has a unique number and an engineer, and is either an express train or a local train
 - A local train can stop at any station
 - An express train only stops at express stations
 - A train can stop at a station for any number of times during a day
 - Train schedules are the same every day

Case study 2

- Design a database consistent with the following:
 - A station has a unique name and an address, and is either an express station or a local station
 - A train has a unique number and an engineer, and is either an express train or a local train
 - A local train can stop at any station
 - An express train only stops at express stations
 - A train can stop at a station for any number of times during a day
 - Train schedules are the same every day

Case study 2: first design




- Nothing in this design prevents express trains from stopping at local stations
 - ☞ We should capture as many constraints as possible
- A train can stop at a station only once during a day
 - ☞ We should not introduce unintended constraints

Case study 2: second design



- A station is either an express station or a local station
- A train is either an express train or a local train
- How to model stop schedule?


Case study 2: second design



Weak entity to model stops
(borrow train number and
station name to uniquely
identify a train stop)

Can we represent every relation as a weak entity
set?
no

Case study 2: second design




The issue is that we are not considering multiple trains entering the same station at the same time.

For this scenario, we would need an id for each train in order to uniquely identify them

Is the extra complexity worth it?

Case study 2: second design (final draft)



Is there a software which can take your design
and analyze it?

Outline



- E/R Diagram Design Cases
- **E/R – Relational Model Translation**

Database design steps

- Understand the real-world domain being modeled
- Specify it using a database design model (e.g., E/R)
- Translate specification to the data model of DBMS (e.g., relational)
- Create DBMS schema

☞ Next: translating E/R design to relational schema


E/R Model to relational schema



Building (name, year)
Room (building name, room number, capacity)
Seat (building name, room number,
seat number, left_or_right)

Translating entity sets

- An entity set translates directly to a table
 - Attributes → columns
 - Key attributes → key columns




User (uid, name)

Group (gid, name)

When you convert an ER diagram to a concrete design, you must consider the type of the attribute


Translating weak entity sets

- Remember the “borrowed” key attributes
- Watch out for attribute name conflicts



Translating relationship sets

- A relationship set translates to a table
 - Keys of connected entity sets → columns
 - Attributes of the relationship set (if any) → columns
 - Multiplicity of the relationship set determines the key of the table




Member (uid, gid, fromDate)

- If we can deduce the general cardinality constraint for a connected entity set E, then take the primary key attributes for E
- Otherwise, choose primary key attributes of each component entity


Translating relationship sets

- A relationship set translates to a table
 - Keys of connected entity sets → columns
 - Attributes of the relationship set (if any) → columns
 - Multiplicity of the relationship set determines the key of the table




- If we can deduce the general cardinality constraint for a connected entity set E, then take the primary key attributes for E
- Otherwise, choose primary key attributes of each component entity

More examples



Parent (parent uid, child uid)


Text



Member (uid, initiator_uid, gid)

Translating double diamonds?

- Recall that a double-diamond (supporting) relationship set connects a weak entity set to another entity set
- No need to translate because the relationship is implicit in the weak entity set's translation



RoomInBuilding


*(room building name, room number,
building_name)*

is subsumed by

Room (building name, room number, capacity)

Translating subclasses & ISA: approach 1

- **Entity-in-all-superclasses** approach (“E/R style”)
 - An entity is represented in the table for each subclass to which it belongs
 - A table includes only the attributes directly attached to the corresponding entity set, plus the inherited key




Translating subclasses & ISA: approach 2

Can query paid users more quickly

If the paid and free users were together, you would need to filter out paid users

- **Entity-in-most-specific-class** approach (“OO style”)


- An entity is only represented in one table (the most specific entity set to which the entity belongs)
- A table includes the attributes attached to the corresponding entity set, plus all inherited attributes



Group (gid, *name*)
 $\langle 142, \text{Bart} \rangle \in \text{User } (\underline{\text{uid}}, \text{name})$
Member (uid, gid, *from_date*)
 $\langle 456, \text{Ralph}, \text{☺} \rangle \in \text{PaidUser } (\underline{\text{uid}}, \text{name}, \text{avatar})$

Translating subclasses & ISA: approach 3

- **All-entities-in-one-table** approach (“**NULL style**”)
 - One relation for the root entity set, with all attributes found in the network of subclasses (plus a “type” attribute when needed)
 - Use a special NULL value in columns that are not relevant for a particular entity



Comparison of three approaches

- Entity-in-all-superclasses

- *User* (uid, name), *PaidUser* (uid, avatar)

- Pro: All users are found in one table

- Con: Attributes of paid users are scattered in different tables

If you have more queries performed on a specific group, it will be better to separate the groups in different tables

- Entity-in-most-specific-class

- *User* (uid, name), *PaidUser* (uid, name, avatar)

- Pro: All attributes of paid users are found in one table

- Con: Users are scattered in different tables

Running queries on all users requires you to query both tables

- All-entities-in-one-table

- *User* (uid, [type,]name, avatar)

- Pro: Everything is in one table


- Con: Lots of NULL's; complicated if class hierarchy is complex

If you do not have a default value which allows you to distinguish paid and free users, than they will appear to be equivalent


A complete example: Case study 2

- Design a database consistent with the following:
 - A station has a unique name and an address, and is either an express station or a local station
 - A train has a unique number and an engineer, and is either an express train or a local train
 - A local train can stop at any station
 - An express train only stops at express stations
 - A train can stop at a station for any number of times during a day
 - Train schedules are the same every day

A complete example



A complete example



Simplifications and refinements

Train (number, engineer), *LocalTrain* (number), *ExpressTrain* (number)
Station (name, address), *LocalStation* (name), *ExpressStation* (name)
LocalTrainStop (local_train_number, station_name, time)
ExpressTrainStop (express_train_number, express_station_name, time)

- Eliminate *LocalTrain* table
 - Redundant: can be computed as
$$\pi_{number}(Train) - ExpressTrain$$
 - Slightly harder to check that *local_train_number* is indeed a local train number
- Eliminate *LocalStation* table
 - It can be computed as $\pi_{number}(Station) - ExpressStation$

An alternative design

Train (number, engineer, type)

Station (name, address, type)

TrainStop (train_number, station_name, time)

- Encode the type of train/station as a column rather than creating subclasses
- What about the following constraints?
 - Type must be either “local” or “express”
 - Express trains only stop at express stations
 - ☞ They can be expressed/declared explicitly as database constraints in SQL (as we will see later in course)
- Arguably a better design because it is simpler!

Design principles

- KISS
 - Keep It Simple, Stupid
- Avoid redundancy
 - Redundancy wastes space, complicates modifications, promotes inconsistency
- Capture essential constraints, but don't introduce unnecessary restrictions
- Use your common sense
 - Warning: mechanical translation procedures given in this lecture are no substitute for your own judgment
- Practice inclusive design—more to come
 - Your database design influences everything built around it and can have profound effects on real people

