

CS340-Fall2020

Group 98

Team Members: Sanjay Ramanathan and Abhash Sharma

Project Step 6 Draft

Link to Working Site: <http://flip2.engr.oregonstate.edu:8040>

Feedback on Step 5 Draft



Zhiming Deng 4 days ago

Do all the items the team indicated as part of What works, in your estimate work according to the project guide?


The Read and Create operations are working on all the pages. However per the requirement of this project, foreign keys (like IDs) should not be manually entered by user, so you might need to change them into a dropdown which is readonly to user, and this dropdown should be pre-populated by the existing data

Another suggestion to the **Read** query, right now I have to type the exact name to query, it will be better to support partial match. To achieve this you only need to add a percentage (%) wildcard to the pattern, you can find example from here:
<https://www.mysqltutorial.org/mysql-like/>

Do you have suggestions to assist on What doesn't work? or Where/why you are blocked? Exceptional peer reviews would give specific steps to the team to overcome

Regarding help1, it looks like that author has already implemented correctly, IMO, updating the relationship table everytime when there is an update on the relationship is pretty normal.

Regarding Help2, I don't think this is an issue either, the pages are responding in less than a second, that should not be considered as slow at all.


**Ben Prince** 3 days ago **Do all the items the team indicated as part of What works, in your estimate work according to the project guide?**

It looks like all search and add functions are working. One thing I noticed was you have to select a doctor's ID rather than a doctors name so you have to go back and figure out ID of the doctor you want. Try populating that specific drop down with the doctors last name. This applies to the doctor/patient relationship page as well.

Do you have suggestions to assist on What doesn't work? or Where/why you are blocked? Exceptional peer reviews would give specific steps to the team to overcome.

Everything works well and looks great. My only suggestion on your progress so far is to pull in actual names rather than ids when adding new rows. It will make it easier to add new rows and the user won't have to quit adding something just so they can go back and find the correct foreign key. Other than that it looks awesome.

[helpful!](#) | 0

**Duane Goodner** 2 days ago **Do all the items the team indicated as part of What works, in your estimate work according to the project guide?**


All ADD, READ and SEARCH functionalities appear to work.

Do you have suggestions to assist on What doesn't work? or Where/why you are blocked?

Help 1: When you have one frontend route that needs to execute multiple SQL queries, it may help to have an intermediate layer of "Service" function(s) in the backend. The route would point to a "Service" function, and this function could then call multiple SQL query functions. When doing this, it also helps to use async / await syntax to avoid deep callback nesting. However, if your project is not already set up for all this now, it likely does not make sense to switch to it now. Just some info for the future. Note: My response assumes you are using NodeJS and not Python / Flask.

Help 2: The site seems very responsive. I don't see any speed issues.

[helpful!](#) | 0

**Evan McKague** 2 days ago

- Do all the items the team indicated as part of *What works*, in your estimate work according to the project guide?
- Do you have suggestions to assist on *What doesn't work?* or *Where/why you are blocked?*

Placeholder

Changes Based on Step 5 Feedback

We have made no changes based on step 5 feedback.

Feedback on Step 4 Draft



Jamie Smead 6 days ago **Are the queries syntactically correct?**
Disregard the part where input will be substituted as shown in the sample_data_manipulation_queries.sql
Yes. Looks great.

Are there queries providing all functionalities as required by the CS340 Project Guide ? What query is missing ? What needs to be fixed?
Yes. Though I'm not entirely sure why the doctor/staff/patients are only returning the id. If it is to update the All doctors/staff/patients tables then it looks like it should return the department/staff type/primary doctor fields as well.

Do the queries cover the relationships as required by the CS340 Project Guide?
I don't see a query where a 1:M relationship would update to NULL. Otherwise looks good.

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, The DDL file loaded into my database correctly.

Are the data types appropriate considering the description of the attribute in the database outline?
Yes. They all look good.

Are the foreign keys correctly defined when compared to the Schema?
Yes, they are all present and my database recognizes them as foreign keys.

Are relationship tables present when compared to the ERD/Schema?
Yes, all tables are present.
[helpful!](#) | 0



Miao Zhao 6 days ago

- Are the queries syntactically correct? Disregard the part where input will be substituted as shown in the sample_data_manipulation_queries.sql
 - Yes. The queries are syntactically correct in the hospitalbase_data_manipulation.sql.
- Are there queries providing all functionalities as required by the CS340 Project Guide ? What query is missing? What needs to be fixed?
 - Yes. The queries from the hospitalbase_data_manipulation.sql provide all functionalities as required by the project guide (INSERT, SELECT, UPDATE, and DELETE SQL statements).
- Do the queries cover the relationships as required by the CS340 Project Guide?
 - Yes. There is a query to add a doctorID and a patientID to the Doctors_Patients table. There is also a query to delete the Doctor-Patient M:M relationship.
- 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. The data types for the Doctors, Patients, Staff, and Doctors_Patients table are appropriate and match the description of the attribute in the database outline. However, I cannot load the Orders and Results table on phpMyAdmin and MariaDB.
- Are the data types appropriate considering the description of the attribute in the database outline?
 - Yes. The data types are appropriate and match the description of the attribute in the database outline for Doctors, Patients, Staff, and Doctors_Patients. However, I couldn't load the Orders and Results table on phpMyAdmin and MariaDB.

◦ Doctors:

Field	Type	Null	Key	Default	Extra
doctorID	int(11)	NO	PRI	NULL	auto_increment
lastName	varchar(255)	NO		NULL	
firstName	varchar(255)	NO		NULL	
department	varchar(255)	NO		NULL	

◦ Patients:

Field	Type	Null	Key	Default	Extra
patientID	int(11)	NO	PRI	NULL	auto_increment
lastName	varchar(255)	NO		NULL	
firstName	varchar(255)	NO		NULL	
primaryDoctorID	int(11)	NO	MUL	NULL	

- Staff:

Field	Type	Null	Key	Default	Extra
staffID	int(11)	NO	PRI		auto_increment
staffType	varchar(255)	NO			
lastName	varchar(255)	NO			
firstName	varchar(255)	NO			

4 rows in set (0.001 sec)

- Orders: Error: table doesn't exist
- Results: Error: table doesn't exist
- Doctors_Patients:

Field	Type	Null	Key	Default	Extra
doctorID	int(11)	NO	PRI		
patientID	int(11)	NO	PRI		

2 rows in set (0.001 sec)

Are the foreign keys correctly defined when compared to the Schema?

- Although I couldn't find the FKs in the schema (page 13), the note under the Entity-Relationship Diagram (pg 12) "For the M:M relationship table, the primary key is the combination for the two foreign key references, named (doctorId, and patientID)", and going through the database outline (page 9 - 11), the primary/DoctorID (FK) is correctly implemented in the Patient table.

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

- Yes, the relationship table for Doctors_Patients is present when compared to the ERD/schema.



Jeovani Vela 3 days ago

- Are the queries syntactically correct? Disregard the part where input will be substituted as shown in the sample_data_manipulation_queries.sql**
 - Yes, the queries are syntactically correct and are working as expected.
- Are there queries providing all functionalities as required by the CS340 Project Guide ? What query is missing ? What needs to be fixed?**
 - Yes, the queries are proving all the functionality as required by the CS340 project guide.
- Do the queries cover the relationships as required by the CS340 Project Guide?**
 - Yes, there is a query to add id for doctor and patient to the Doctors_Patients table. Additionally they also implemented a query to delete the Doctor-Patient M:M relationship which conforms with the requirements laid out in the guide.
- 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, they import to phpMyAdmin works as expected .
- Are the data types appropriate considering the description of the attribute in the database outline?**
 - Yes, the data types used appear to be appropriate in accordance with their ERD and schema.
- Are the foreign keys correctly defined when compared to the Schema?**
 - The foreign keys seem to be defined correctly as the database when pulled recognizes them correctly.
- Are relationship tables present when compared to the ERD/Schema?**
 - Yes the relationship tables shown are accurately reflected in the ERD/Schema.



Roger Hill 3 days ago

- **Are the queries syntactically correct? Disregard the part where input will be substituted as shown in the sample_data_manipulation_queries.sql**
 - The queries in the Doctors, Patients, and Staff appear syntactically correct including auto-incrementing primary_keys, and have the correct data types. The Orders, and Results tables are missing from the database that I imported.
- **Are there queries providing all functionalities as required by the CS340 Project Guide ? What query is missing ? What needs to be fixed?**
 - Each of the Doctors, Patients, and Staff tables are prepopulated with 5 rows. The Orders, and Results tables were missing from my data dump
 - Yes, there will be 5 entities (>4), and 6 relationships once the database is complete.
 - Yes, there are 2 M:M relationships (>= 1)
 - Yes, each of the 5 tables in the UI has an insert option.
 - Yes, each of the 5 tables in the UI, has inquire(search) options
 - Yes, there is 1 delete for deletion of existing order, and 1 update for update order.
 - Yes, there is a deletion option for deleting an existing order to satisfy the delete functionality for an M:M relationship.
 - Yes, there is a nullable 0/1:M relationship between Staff and Orders.
- **Do the queries cover the relationships as required by the CS340 Project Guide?**
 - Yes, the nullable 0/1:M, and deletion of a line for the M:M relationship are covered in the ERD.
- **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!)**
 - The Orders, and Results tables don't source into my MariaDB.
 - ERROR 1146 (42S02) at line 126 in file: 'hospitalbase.sql': Table 'cs340_hillro.Orders' doesn't exist
 - ERROR 1146 (42S02) at line 138 in file: 'hospitalbase.sql': Table 'cs340_hillro.Results' doesn't exist
 - The Doctors, Patients, and Staff table are fine.
- **Are the data types appropriate considering the description of the attribute in the database outline?**
 - The datatypes between the ERD, and the database match for each of the Doctors, Patients, and Staff DB tables.
- **Are the foreign keys correctly defined when compared to the Schema?**
 - Yes, the six foreign keys appear to match the schema.
- **Are relationship tables present when compared to the ERD/Schema?**
 - Yes, the Doctors_Patients table is present in the schema.

Changes Based on Feedback

- Read queries on Doctors, Patients, and Staff Displays more than just their id value.
- Orders and Results tables correctly source into MariaDB, the issue with reviewer Roger Hill was an anomaly.

Work From Previous Steps:

Feedback by Peer Reviewer



Michael Kim 5 days ago

- **Does the UI utilize a *SELECT* for every table in the schema?** In other words, data from each table in the schema should be displayed on the UI. Note: it is generally not acceptable for just a single query to join all tables and displays them. yes, there is a create tab that explicitly looks at all of the entities as search forms
- **Does at least one *SELECT* utilize a search/filter with a dynamically populated list of properties?** yes, all of them do, as they can be updated in the update tab
- **Does the UI implement an *INSERT* for every table in the schema?** In other words, there should be UI input fields that correspond to each table and attribute in that table. yes, there is a create table for this purpose
- **Does each *INSERT* also add the corresponding FK attributes, including at least one M:M relationship?** In other words if there is a M:M relationship between Orders and Products, INSERTing a new Order (e.g. orderID, customerID, date, total), should also INSERT row(s) in the intersection table, e.g. OrderDetails (orderID, productID, qty, price and line_total). yes in the create table, you can specify the many to many relationship based on how you fill out the form
- **Is there at least one *DELETE* and does at least one *DELETE* remove things from a M:M relationship?** In other words, if an order is deleted from the Orders table, it should also delete the corresponding rows from the OrderDetails table, BUT it should not delete any Products or Customers. yes there is a delete tab that fulfills this requirement
- **Is there at least one *UPDATE* for any one entity?** In other words, in the case of Products, can productName, listPrice, qtyOnHand, e.g. be updated for a single ProductID record? yes, there is a table specifically dedicated for the update
- **Is at least one relationship *NULLable*?** In other words, there should be at least one optional relationship, e.g. having an Employee might be optional for any Order. Thus it should be feasible to edit an Order and change the value of Employee to be empty. yes, you can fill out the form with empty spaces and they will have null values
- **Do you have any other suggestions for the team to help with their HTML UI?** I like the way you have split everything up into individual tabs for the functionality, I worry that it may become too simple for the multiple tables and attributes as you will have to be quite careful that the information that is being updated or created are going to the right tables in your schema.



Bradley Cypert 2 days ago

Does the UI utilize a SELECT for every table in the schema?

- There is only one Search Results page, however I am assuming after searching with Order ID, Doctor ID, and Order type, it will result in listing the staff involved, doctors information, results, and patients information, which is all a part of the Orders table

Does at least one SELECT utilize a search/filter with a dynamically populated list of properties?

- Yes, the functionality with the Order type can list multiple tests of that type with the corresponding Doctor and Order

Does the UI implement an INSERT for every table in the schema?

- Yes, there is currently no INSERT functionality for what Staff is associated with a new order in the initial creation causing it to be NULL, and in UPDATE you then can add the staffID associated with the order

Does each INSERT also add the corresponding FK attributes, including at least one M:M relationship?

- Yes, in the M:M relationship between Doctors and Patients, as the patientID and doctorID are inserted, each gets a newly updated orderID added that corresponds to that doctor and patient alone

Is there at least one DELETE and does at least one DELETE remove things from a M:M relationship?

- Yes you are able to DELETE an order through the orderID, doctorID, and type

Is there at least one UPDATE for any one entity?

- Yes this is where you can add a staffID, so I am assuming no matter what the creation initializing staffID associated with the order as NULL

Is at least one relationship NULLable?

- Yes, the staff initialization is automatically NULLED

Do you have any other suggestions for the team to help with their HTML UI?

- It looks pretty, simple, and quite honestly you are all on the right page. Maybe in the Inquire page, sort orders by date, which I'm sure you will.



Francisco hernandez 2 days ago **Does the UI utilize a SELECT for every table in the schema? In other words, data from each table in the schema should be displayed on the UI. Note: it is generally not acceptable for just a single query to join all tables and displays them.**

If the Inquire displays all the information once an inquire is complete then yes. Based on the information that must be inputted for an inquiry, It will display said information.

Does at least one SELECT utilize a search/filter with a dynamically populated list of properties?

Yes, the inquire can search for different types of tests such as x-rays, blood tests, and prescription lists

Does the UI implement an INSERT for every table in the schema? In other words, there should be UI input fields that correspond to each table and attribute in that table.

There is a create patient order which should affect all the tables so, yes.

Does each INSERT also add the corresponding FK attributes, including at least one M:M relationship? In other words if there is a M:M relationship between Orders and Products, INSERTing a new Order (e.g. orderID, customerID, date, total), should also INSERT row(s) in the intersection table, e.g. OrderDetails (orderID, productID, qty, price and line_total).

Yes, the create button allows the user to input information for each column.

Is there at least one DELETE and does at least one DELETE remove things from a M:M relationship? In other words, if an order is deleted from the Orders table, it should also delete the corresponding rows from the OrderDetails table, BUT it should not delete any Products or Customers.

Yes, deletion functionality appears to be implemented.

Is there at least one UPDATE for any one entity? In other words, in the case of Products, can productName, listPrice, qtyOnHand, e.g. be updated for a single ProductID record?

Yes there is an update function made for order entity's.

Is at least one relationship NULLable? In other words, there should be at least one optional relationship, e.g. having an Employee might be optional for any Order. Thus it should be feasible to edit an Order and change the value of Employee to be empty.

Yes, Staff is a 0:M relationship so the value can be empty upon editing and order.

Do you have any other suggestions for the team to help with their HTML UI?

Looks good, especially the forms.

Comments from grader(Troy Jurach):

Good job overall. After reviewing the draft of your site, my biggest concern is there isn't a page for each entity. It looks like you can do an update, delete, add, inquire on the an order for a patient, but you can't add/delete/view a doctor, or patient, staff, etc. Its effective in terms of being able to manipulate an order, but what about the other entities in the database? Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Troy Jurach , Nov 6 at 5:22pm

Actions based on Feedback

- We overhauled our website design to allow “select every table in the schema”. Now, clicking search allows users to search for doctors, orders, patients, staff, and result of orders.
- Also, to allow ‘insert for every table in the schema”, clicking add allows users to choose what they want to add to the database. There is a separate add page for each table.
- We added a sample result for every search page. It shows that the website utilizes a dynamically populated list to display results.

Upgrades to the Draft Version -

The Draft version is left as is.

- Only, the name of the website is changed to reflect the overhaul in design. We changed it from DoctorBase to HospitalBase.

CS 340 Team Evaluation Form
November 8, 2020

RATE YOUR TEAMS PERFORMANCE USING THE SCALE BELOW.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Agree 4 = Strongly Agree

GROUP NUMBER		
NAME OF GROUP TEAM MEMBERS:		
SCALE AND COMMENTS	RATING	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
HOW PREPARED WAS YOUR TEAM? Research, reading, and assignment complete	4	
HOW RESPONSIVE & COMMUNICATIVE WERE YOU BOTH AS A TEAM? Responded to requests and assignment modifications needed. Initiated and responded appropriately via email, Slack etc.	4	

DID BOTH GROUP MEMBERS PARTICIPATE EQUALLY Contributed best academic ability	4	
DID YOU BOTH FOLLOW THE INITIAL TEAM CONTRACT? Were both team members both positive and productive?	4	

Are there any suggestions for improvement for your team and what are your goals moving forward?

- No suggestions for improvement.
- Goals: try to shift the website into a python/flask version, if time permits.

All Material From Previous Steps

Project Step 3 Draft Version: Design HTML Interface

Link: <http://flip2.engr.oregonstate.edu:7020>

Changes Based on Feedback on Step 2 Final Draft:

Our TA informed us that everything seemed right with our Final Draft for Step 2. Hence, we decided to not make any changes for Step 3 Draft.

Feedback by the peer reviewer



Ryan Jensen 7 days ago

- **Does the overview describe what problem is to be solved by a website with DB back end?**
 - Yes it does. Very descriptive!
- **Does the overview list specific facts?**
 - Yes, it provides specific numbers in terms of doctors, patients, tables, orders/results, etc.
- **Are at least four entities described and does each one represent a single idea to be stored as a list?**
 - Yes.
- **Does the outline of entity details describe the purpose of each, list attribute data types and constraints and describe relationships between entities?**
 - Yes, it does, very descriptive and detailed.
- **Does the outline clearly indicate which entities (tables) will be implemented and which team member is primarily assigned to the associated page(s)?**
 - It outlines the entities to be implemented but does not declare which team member is primarily assigned to the page.
- **Are 1:M relationships correctly formulated? Is there at least one M:M relationship?**
 - Yes!
- **Is there consistency in a) naming between overview and entity/attributes b) entities plural, attributes singular c) use of capitalization for naming?**
 - Yes, they've kept the naming of entities/attributes standardized.



Zhiming Deng 6 days ago

Does the overview describe what problem is to be solved by a website with DB back end? - Yes, they did give a detailed background to describe the problem.

Does the overview list specific facts? - Yes they estimated the number of doctors, patients and orders.

Are at least four entities described and does each one represent a single idea to be stored as a list? - Yes there are 5 entities and 1 M:M relationship, each of them represents a single idea (entity or relationship).

Does the outline of entity details describe the purpose of each, list attribute data types and constraints and describe relationships between entities? Yes, there are detailed description for each entity. However I feel like that Doctor is also a kind of Staff, because in the Staff entity, the member `staffType` indicates that Nurse and Neurology and many other professions belong to Staff, in my opinion, the doctor should be also part of them.

Does the outline clearly indicate which entities (tables) will be implemented and which team member is primarily assigned to the associated page(s)? I did see that part of the work will be implemented by one of the team member, I didn't see the assignment for the other team member but I can assume that the remaining part will be implemented by the other team member. It will be better if it is mentioned explicitly.

Are 1:M relationships correctly formulated? Is there at least one M:M relationship? Yes.

Is there consistency in a) naming between overview and entity/attributes b) entities plural, attributes singular c) use of capitalization for naming? Yes they are pretty consistent. But one small nit: I will prefer `DoctorsPatients` over `Doctors_Patients` (maybe i was wrong:))



Shukie Yuk Shu Li 6 days ago **Does the overview describe what problem is to be solved by a website with DB back end?**

- Yes. They mentioned how the existence of multiple data types & relationships among their 5 entities would be problematic without a db back end.

Does the overview list specific facts?

- Yes. Numerical facts describing the scale of the database is provided, the number of entity and tables are also provided.

Are at least four entities described and does each one represent a single idea to be stored as a list?

- Yes.

Does the outline of entity details describe the purpose of each, list attribute datatypes and constraints and describe relationships between entities?

- Each entity comes with a description of its purpose.
- Attribute datatypes and constraints are given. However, I think the length of each datatype could be included for more clarity. For example, varchar datatypes could be followed with a length (ie varchar(255)).
- Relationships are listed in great detail. Cardinality and participation are both included in the relationship notations. I think this is a good notation to use in general since it depicts a lot more information with little added content.

Does the outline clearly indicate which entities (tables) will be implemented and which team member is primarily assigned to the associated page(s)?

- No. They only indicate which member will be implementing the chosen M:M relationship, but not for entities and other relationships.

Are 1:M relationships correctly formulated?

- Yes.

Is there at least one M:M relationship?

- Yes.

Is there consistency in a) naming between overview and entity/attributes b) entities plural, attributes singular c) use of capitalization for naming?

- a) Yes.
- b) Yes.
- c) Yes.



Michael Kim 6 days ago **Does the overview describe what problem is to be solved by a website with DB back end?**

Yes the purpose can be implied as aiding doctors with orders and patients

- **Does the overview list specific facts?**

Yes the facts are there, but they are not specific, but ranges of what it should be

- **Are at least four entities described and does each one represent a single idea to be stored as a list?**

Yes there are 4 entities doctors patients staff and orders

- **Does the outline of entity details describe the purpose of each, list attribute data types and constraints and describe relationships between entities?**

Yes, all of the entities and their attributes are clearly outlined and their relationship with each other are shown

- **Does the outline clearly indicate which entities (tables) will be implemented and which team member is primarily assigned to the associated page(s)?**

Yes, they have outlined which entities they will be doing

- **Are 1:M relationships correctly formulated? Is there at least one M:M relationship?**

Yes there is a Many to many relationship

- **Is there consistency in a) naming between overview and entity/attributes b) entities plural, attributes singular c) use of capitalization for naming?**

Yes, they have consistent naming

Actions based on the feedback

- Actions not taken:
- Kept Doctors_Patients naming convention as is because we are already comfortable with Doctors_Patients over the suggested DoctorPatient.
- It was suggested that we must include Doctors in the Staff entity. While this is a great suggestion, we have decided to separate Doctors from other members of the hospital workforce. We will not be handling the case when a Doctor refers a patient to another Doctor.
- Actions taken:
- Now we have a member responsible for each entity table.
- Where appropriate we have added varchar(255). This would be beneficial when coding so we have decided to change it.

Upgrades to the Draft version

- No self-inforced design changes on the database.
- Changed the rough hand-drawn ERD and Schema with clean computer generated diagrams.

Updated: Project Step 2 Draft Version: ERD & Schema

a) Fixes based on Feedback from Step 1:

- The grader advised us to clearly point out the entities of our database in our proposal section. Also, we were told to explain how a client could benefit from our database.
- We have decided to fix our proposal by adding two new sections to the Overview of our proposal. First we will clearly list out our entities. Then, we will explain how our database could help potential clients.
- Out of the two M:M relationships, only the Doctors:Patients relationship will be implemented in the final project.

b) Project Outline and Database Outline - Updated Version:

a) Overview:

A hospital consisting of 50+ doctors and staff members, 1000+ patients, and 5000+ orders and results, allows for quite a bit of complexity. There are five entities in the database: 1) Doctors, 2) Patients, 3) Staff, 4) Orders, and 5) Results. Among these 5 entities, there can be different types, multiple relationships, and numerous ways for information to get lost/mixed up.

A database with around 5-10 tables (for entities and relationships) in combination with a neat front-end display with about 3-5 pages, allows for a much easier and efficient way of viewing and managing this data.

Doctors would be able to put in Orders (additional visits, blood tests, x-ray, etc) for Patients, and assign it to a pertinent Staff. At the other end, Staff can check the Orders that need to be fulfilled, fulfill it accordingly and load up the Results of the Order. Eventually, Doctors, in their own time, or in Patient's next visit would be able to check on the Results of their Order.

Our Database will allow a small hospital to securely initiate, track, and fulfill orders for all Patients that decide to get treatment there. Besides that, more functionalities, where only certain types of doctors or staff can issue certain orders or change the status of the order, can be added.

b) Database outline, in words:

A database for a small clinic/hospital.

1. Doctors: Records the details of Doctors that work in Hospital.

- doctorID: int, auto_increment, unique, not NULL, PK
- lastName: varchar(255), not NULL

- firstName: varchar(255), not NULL
- department: varchar(255), not NULL
- Relationship (Doctor-Patient)(0M:1M): Doctors can have zero or many Patients and a Patient can have one or many Doctors. Defined in Doctor_Patient table.
- Relationship (Doctors-Orders)(11:0M): An Order can come from one and only one Doctor, while a Doctor can send zero to multiple Orders, doctorID is FK in Order
- Relationship (Doctor-Patient)(11:0M): All Patients must have one and only one primary Doctor, while a Doctor can be a primary Doctor for zero to multiple Patients, primaryDoctorID is a FK in Patient
- Implemented by: Abhash Sharma

2. Patients: All the Patients who are being/have been treated by the hospital

- patientID: int, auto_increment, unique, not NULL, PK
- lastName: varchar(255), not NULL
- firstName: varchar(255), not NULL
- primaryDoctorID: assigns Doctor to a Patient, not NULL FK
- Relationship (Patient-Order)(11:0M): an Order can be connected to just one Patient, but a Patient can have zero to multiple Orders. patientID is FK in Order.
- Relationship (Patient-Staff)(0M:0M): A Patient can be handled by zero or multiple Staff and vice versa. Defined in Staff_Patient table.
- Relationship (Doctors-Patients)(0M:1M): Doctors can have zero or many Patients and a Patient can have one or many Doctors. Defined in Doctor_Patient table.
- Implemented by: Abhash Sharma

3. Staff: All types of Staff members currently active in the hospital

- staffID: int, auto_increment, unique, not NULL, PK
- staffType: (Nurse, Pharmacy, Lab Technician, Radiology, Neurology etc.), varchar(255), not NULL
- lastName: varchar(255), not NULL
- firstName: varchar(255), not NULL
- Relationship (Staff-Order)(01:0M): A Staff can have zero or multiple Orders to handle. An Order can only be handled by one and only one Staff. staffID is FK in Order.
- Relationship (Patient-Staff)(0M:0M): A Patient can be handled by zero or multiple Staff and vice versa. Defined in Staff_Patient table. -
- Implemented by: Sanjay Ramanathan

4. Orders: All the Orders made to Patients

- orderID: int, auto_increment, unique, not NULL, PK
- date: date, not NULL, date the Order was generated
- time: time, not NULL, time the Order was generated
- orderType: (prescription, x-ray, blood test, specialist appointment, etc.), varchar(255), not NULL
- patientID: used to connect Patient to Order, not NULL, FK
- doctorID: used to connect an Order to Doctor, not NULL, FK
- staffID: NULL (until assignment), used to connect an Order to Staff, FK
- Relationship (Order-Result)(1:1): An Order can have one and only one Result, and a Result can have one and only one Order. orderID is FK in Results
- Implemented by: Sanjay Ramanathan

5. Results: The Results of all the Orders made to Patients

- resultID: int, auto_increment, unique, not NULL, PK
- status (Received/in progress/Completed/Sent): varchar(255), not NULL
- orderID: used to connect an Order to a Result, not NULL, FK
- date: NULL, date on which the Result was generated (on which the Order was fulfilled)
- accessedByDoctor: bool, FALSE, changed to TRUE only after doctorID in Order or patientID's primaryDoctorID accesses the Results.
- Implemented by: Sanjay Ramanathan


6. Doctors_Patients: Assigns a Doctor to a Patient(M:M relationship table)

- doctorID: the Doctor being assigned to a Patient, not NULL, FK
- patientID: the Patient being assigned to a Doctor, not NULL, FK
- Implemented by: Sanjay Ramanathan

Identify entities and M:M relationship to implement and assign to team members.


- The final tables we will apply in our project are Doctors, Patients, Staff, Orders, Results, and Doctors_Patients.
- The two many-to-many relationships from Step 1 were: 1) Between Doctors and Patients and 2) Between Staff and Patients.
- We will implement the 1) Doctor-Patient M:M relationship.
- Other site features such as the home page and error pages will be implemented by Sanjay Ramanathan

c) Entity-Relationship Diagram:



The primary key in the 5 entities here is an auto incrementing ID, named doctorID, patientID, orderID, resultID, and staffID, correspondingly. For the M:M relationship table, the primary key is the combination of the two foreign key references, named (doctorID, patientID).

d) Schema:



CS340 Team Evaluation Form

October 28, 2020

RATE YOUR TEAMS PERFORMANCE USING THE SCALE BELOW.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Agree 4 = Strongly Agree

GROUP NUMBER	98	
NAME OF GROUP TEAM MEMBERS:	Abhash Sharma Sanjay Ramanathan	
SCALE AND COMMENTS	RATING	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
HOW PREPARED WAS YOUR TEAM? Research, reading, and assignment complete	4	
HOW RESPONSIVE & COMMUNICATIVE WERE YOU BOTH AS A TEAM? Responded to requests and assignment modifications needed. Initiated and responded appropriately via email, Slack etc.	4	
DID BOTH GROUP MEMBERS PARTICIPATE EQUALLY Contributed best academic ability	4	

<p>DID YOU BOTH FOLLOW THE INITIAL TEAM CONTRACT?</p> <p>Were both team members both positive and productive?</p>	<p>4</p>	
--	----------	--

Are there any suggestions for improvement for your team and what are your goals moving forward?

(Better communication, follow the contract better, modify the initial team contract, more contribution, etc)?

- Going forward we will keep working as we have been till this point.
- Our goal is that this will yield the same level of success that we have been at.