Other Constraints and Assertions

"check" constraints

 We've seen a check clause on a user-defined domain:

```
create domain Grade as smallint
  default null
  check (value>=0 and value <=100);</pre>
```

- You can also define a check constraint
 - on an attribute
 - on the tuples of a relation
 - across relations



Attribute-based "check" constraints

- Defined with a single attribute and constrain its value (in every tuple).
- Can only refer to that attribute.
- Can include a subquery.
- Example:

```
create table Student (
   sID integer,
   program varchar(5) check
      (program in (select post from P)),
   firstName varchar(15) not null, ...);
```

 Condition can be anything that could go in a WHERE clause.

When they are checked

- Only when a tuple is inserted into that relation, or its value for that attribute is updated.
- If a change somewhere else violates the constraint, the DBMS will not notice. E.g.,
 - If a student's program changes to something not in table P, we get an error.
 - But if table P drops a program that some student has, there is no error.



"not null" constraints

 You can declare that an attribute of a table is NOT NULL.

```
create table Course(
  cNum integer,
  name varchar(40) not null,
  dept Department,
  wr boolean,
  primary key (cNum, dept));
```

- In practise, many attributes should be not null.
- This is a very specific kind of attribute-based constraint.



Tuple-based "check" constraints

- Defined as a separate element of the table schema, so can refer to any attributes of the table.
- Again, condition can be anything that could go in a where clause, and can include a subquery.

Example:

```
create table Student (
   sID integer,
   age integer, year integer,
   college varchar(4),
   check (year = age - 18),
   check college in
        (select name from Colleges));
```



When they are checked

- Only when a tuple is inserted into that relation, or updated.
- Again, if a change somewhere else violates the constraint, the DBMS will not notice.



How nulls affect "check" constraints

- A check constraint only fails if it evaluates to false.
- It is not picky like a WHERE condition.
- E.g.: check (age > 0)

age	Value of condition	CHECK outcome	WHERE outcome
19	TRUE	pass	pass
-5	FALSE	fail	fail
NULL	unknown	pass	fail



Example

Suppose you created this table:

```
create table Frequencies(
  word varchar(10),
  num integer,
  check (num > 5));
```

- It would allow you to insert ('hello', null)
 since null passes the constraint check (num > 5)
- If you need to prevent that, use a "not null" constraint.

```
create table Frequencies(
   word varchar(10),
   num integer not null,
   check (num > 5));
```

Naming your constraints

- If you name your constraint, you will get more helpful error messages.
- This can be done with any of the types of constraint we've seen.
- Add

```
constraint «name»
before the
  check («condition»)
```



Examples

```
create domain Grade as smallint
 default null
 constraint gradeInRange
     check (value>=0 and value <=100));
create domain Campus as varchar(4)
  not null
  constraint validCampus
    check (value in ('StG', 'UTM', 'UTSC'));
create table Offering(...
 constraint validCourseReference
  foreign key (cNum, dept) references Course);
```



• Order of constraints doesn't matter, and doesn't dictate the order in which they're checked.



Assertions

- Check constraints can't express complex constraints across tables, e.g.,
 - Every loan has at least one customer, who has an account with at least \$1,000.
 - For each branch, the sum of all loan amounts < the sum of all account balances.
- Assertions are schema elements at the top level, so can express cross-table constraints:

```
create assertion (<name>) check (<predicate>);
```



Powerful but costly

- SQL has a fairly powerful syntax for expressing the predicates, including quantification.
- Assertions are costly because
 - They have to be checked upon every database update (although a DBMS may be able to limit this).
 - Each check can be expensive.
- Testing and maintenance are also difficult.
- So assertions must be used with great care.



Triggers

- Assertions are powerful, but costly.
- Check constraints are less costly, but less powerful.
- Triggers are a compromise between these extremes:
 - They are cross-table constraints, as powerful as assertions.
 - But you control the cost by having control over when they are applied.



The basic idea

- You specify three things.
 - Event: Some type of database action, e.g., after delete on Courses or before update of grade on Took
 - Condition: A boolean-valued expression, e.g.,
 when grade > 95
 - Action: Any SQL statements, e.g., insert into Winners values (sID)



Reaction Policies

Example

- Suppose R = Took and S = Student.
- What sorts of action must simply be rejected?
- But a deletion or update with an sID that occurs in Took could be allowed ...



Possible policies

- cascade: propagate the change to the referring table
- set null: set the referring attribute(s) to null
- There are other options we won't cover.
 Many DBMSs don't support all of them.
- If you say nothing, the default is to forbid the change in the referred-to table.



Reaction policy example

- In the University schema, what should happen in these situations:
 - csc343 changes number to be 543
 - student 99132 is deleted
 - student 99132's grade in csc148 is raised to 85.
 - csc148 is deleted



Note the asymmetry

- Suppose table R refers to table S.
- You can define "fixes" that propogate changes backwards from S to R.
- (You define them in table R because it is the table that will be affected.)
- You cannot define fixes that propagate forward from R to S.



Syntax for specifying a reaction policy

- Add your reaction policy where you specify the foreign key constraint.
- Example:



What you can react to

- Your reaction policy can specify what to do either
 - on delete, i.e., when a deletion creates a dangling reference,
 - on update, i.e., when an update creates a dangling reference,
 - or both. Just put them one after the other.
 Example:
 - on delete restrict on update cascade



What your reaction can be

- Your policy can specify one of these reactions (there are others):
 - restrict: Don't allow the deletion/update.
 - cascade: Make the same deletion/update in the referring tuple.
 - set null: Set the corresponding value in the referring tuple to null.



Semantics of Deletion

- What if deleting a tuple violates a foreign key constraint?
- Example:

```
DELETE FROM Course
WHERE dept = 'CSC';
```



Semantics of Deletion

• What if deleting one tuple violates a foreign key constraint, but deleting others does not?



DDL Wrap-up

Updating the schema itself

Alter: alter a domain or table

```
alter table Course
  add column numSections integer;
alter table Course
  drop column breadth;
```

- Drop: remove a domain, table, or whole schema drop table course;
- How is that different from this?
 delete from course;
- If you drop a table that is referenced by another table, you must specify "cascade"
- This removes all referring rows.

There's more to DDL

- For example, you can also define:
 - indices: for making search faster (we'll discuss these later).
 - privileges: who can do what with what parts of the database
- See csc443.

