The main weakness of this ERD design is that the customer Orders table does not add any new information. Its sole purpose is in linking the customer to the Customer Orders Products table. This can also be accomplished without the Customer Orders table but having the customer id be in the Customer Orders Products table instead of the order id. This will preserve the relation between the customers with the products they ordered while cutting out a table. Therefore, reducing the probability of data corruption, errors and anomalies while freeing up system resources.

The other area worth improving is in the inconsistent naming, whereas Order number and product code make sense. It breaks away from naming conventions of naming the primary key end with id and also the consistency of the naming between two tables. Losing the ability to easily identify the linked keys with just a glance.

The other area of redundancy is in the tables Products and Customers. Which have columns labels such as product\_ name and product\_price when name and price would have sufficed. Reserved words such as id makes sense with the prefix product as this would cause a lot of errors and become confusing if it was left as just id as every table has an id.