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Educational objective for today . . .

- Goals and steps of the database design process
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- Goals and steps of the database design process
- Rules to transform ER schemas into relation schemas
Goal of Design

- Data management for multiple application systems, for multiple years
- Therefore: special importance
- Design requirements
  - For every application, it should be possible to derive application data from data in the database — efficiently
  - Only store “sensible” (actually needed) data
  - Avoid redundancies
Phase Model

Requirement Analysis

Concepcional Design

Distribution Design

Logical Design

Data Definition

Physical Design

Implementation & Maintenance
Requirements Analysis

- **Approach:** Collecting information needs from all specialist divisions

- **Result:**
  - Informal description (text, tabular lists, forms, etc.) of the problem domain
  - Separation of the information about data (data analysis) from the information about functions (functional analysis)

- **“Classical” DB design:**
  - Only data analysis and following steps

- **Functional design:**
  - See methods of software engineering
Conceptual Design

- First formal description of the problem domain
- **Language means:** semantical data model
- **Process:**
  - Modeling of views, e.g., for different specialist divisions
  - Analysis of existing views with respect to conflicts
  - Integration of views into a full schema
- **Result:** full conceptual schema, e.g., ER diagram
Phases of Conceptual Design

Conceptional Design

View Design

View Analysis

View Integration
Further Steps During Design

- ER modeling of different **views** of the complete information, e.g., for different specialist divisions of a company \( \leadsto \text{conceptual design} \)
  - Analysis and integration of views
  - Result: full conceptual schema
- Distribution design when using distributed storage
- Transformation to concrete implementation model (e.g., relational model) \( \leadsto \text{logical design} \)
- Data definition, implementation and maintenance \( \leadsto \text{physical design} \)
View Integration

- Analysis of existing view with respect to conflicts
- Integration of views into a full schema
Integration Conflicts

- **Naming conflicts**: Homonyms / synonyms
  - Homonyms: bank (money / river); order (command / request for goods)
  - Synonyms: car, vehicle, automobile

- **Typing conflicts**: different structures for the same element

- **Domain mismatch**: different domains for an element

- **Identifier conflicts**: e.g., different keys for the same element

- **Structural conflicts**: same fact expressed in different ways
Distribution Design

- If data should be distributed to several machines, a way of distributed storage must be determined.

- E.g., for a relation CUSTOMER (CNo, Name, Address, Zipcode, Account)
  - **Horizontal** distribution:
    CUSTOMER_1 (CNo, Name, Address, Zipcode, Account) where Zipcode < 50 000
    CUSTOMER_2 (CNo, Name, Address, Zipcode, Account) where Zipcode >= 50 000
  - **Vertical** distribution (connection via attribute CNo):
    CUSTOMER_Adr (CNo, Name, Address, Zipcode)
    CUSTOMER_Account (CNo, Account)
Logical Design

- **Language means:** Data model of the chosen “implementation” DBMS, e.g., relational model

- **Process:**
  1. (Automatical) transformation of the conceptual schema, e.g., ER $\rightarrow$ relational model
  2. Improvement of the relational schema based on quality criteria (normalization, see Chapter 5):
     Design goals: avoid redundancies, . . .

- **Result:** logical schema, e.g., collection of relational schemas
Data Definition

- Translation of logical schema into a concrete schema
- **Language means:** DDL and DML of DBMS (e.g., Oracle, DB2, SQL Server)
  - Database declaration in the DDL of the DBMS
  - Realization of integrity constraints
  - Definition of views
Physical Design

- Supplement physical design with support for efficient access, e.g., by defining indexes
- **Index**
  - Access path: data structure for additional, key-based access to tuples \( (\text{key attribute value, tuple address}) \)
  - Usually implemented as a B*-tree
- **Language means:** *storage structure (definition) language* SSL
Indexes in SQL

```sql
create [ unique ] index indexname
   on relname ( attrname [ asc | desc ], attrname [ asc | desc ], ... )
```

Example

```sql
create index WineIdx on WINES (Name)
```
Necessity of Access Paths

- Example: Table with 100 GB of data, hard disk transfer rate of ca. 50 MB/s
- Operation: Search for a tuple (selection)
- Implementation: Sequential search
- Cost: $102,400 / 50 = 2.048 \text{ sec.} \approx 34 \text{ min.}$
Implementation and Maintenance

- Phases of ...
  - Maintenance,
  - Further optimization of the physical layer,
  - Adaptation to new requirements or operating system platforms,
  - Porting to new database management systems
  - etc.
Transformation of the Conceptual Schema

- Translation to logical schema
  - Example: ER $\rightarrow$ RM
  - Correct?
  - Quality of transformation?

- Preservation of *information capacity*
  - Is it possible, after the transformation, to store exactly the same data as before?
  - ... or more?
  - ... or less?
Capacity-increasing Transformation

Transformation into

\[ R = \{\text{LicenseNo, Vineyard}\} \]

with exactly one key

\[ K = \{\{\text{LicenseNo}\}\} \]

Possible invalid relation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has</th>
<th>LicenseNo</th>
<th>Vineyard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Helena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Helena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capacity-preserving Transformation

- Correct instantiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has</th>
<th>LicenseNo</th>
<th>Vineyard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Helena Müller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Correct set of keys

\[ K = \{\{\text{LicenseNo}\}, \{\text{Vineyard}\}\} \]
Capacity-decreasing Transformation

Relation schema with one key \{WName\}

Instantiation that is no longer valid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ConsistsOf</th>
<th>WName</th>
<th>GrapeName</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zinfandel Red Blossom</td>
<td>Zinfandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bordeaux Blanc</td>
<td>Cabernet Sauvignon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bordeaux Blanc</td>
<td>Muscadelle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capacity-preserving when using the keys of both entity types as the new key in the relation schema

\[ K = \{\{WName, GrapeName\}\} \]
Example Transformation ER-RM: Input

- **Grape**
  - **Color**
  - **Grape Name**

- **Producer**
  - **Vineyard**
  - **Address**

- **Wine**
  - **Amount**
  - **WName**
  - **Color**
  - **Year**
  - **Res. Sugar**

- **Consists Of**

- **Produce**
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Example Transformation ER-RM: Result

1. \( \text{GRAPE} = \{\text{Color, GrapeName}\} \) with \( K_{\text{GRAPE}} = \{\{\text{GrapeName}\}\} \)
2. \( \text{ConsistsOf} = \{\text{GrapeName, WName, Amount}\} \) with \( K_{\text{ConsistsOf}} = \{\{\text{GrapeName, WName}\}\} \)
3. \( \text{WINE} = \{\text{Color, WName, Vintage, Res.Sugar}\} \) with \( K_{\text{WINE}} = \{\{\text{WName}\}\} \)
4. \( \text{PRODUCE} = \{\text{WName, Vineyard}\} \) with \( K_{\text{PRODUCE}} = \{\{\text{WName}\}\} \)
5. \( \text{PRODUCER} = \{\text{Vineyard, Address}\} \) with \( K_{\text{PRODUCER}} = \{\{\text{Vineyard}\}\} \)
ER Transformation into Relations

- **Entity types and relationship types**: both transformed into relation schemas
- **Attributes**: attributes of the relation schema, **keys** are adopted
- **Cardinalities** of the relationships: expressed in respective relation schemas by choice of keys
- In some cases: **merge** of the relation schemas of entity and relationship types
- Introduce foreign key constraints between the remaining relation schemas
Transformation of Relationship Types

- New relation schema with all attributes of the relationship type; additionally, adopt all primary keys of the participating entity types

**Determining keys:**

- **m:n relationship:** both primary keys together form the key in the new relation schema
- **1:n relationship:** primary keys of the n-side (in the functional notation, this is the side without the arrowhead) form key in the new relation schema
- **1:1 relationship:** both primary keys become a key in the new relation schema; the primary key is then chosen from these keys
n:m Relationships

Transformation

1. \( \text{GRAPE} = \{\text{Color}, \text{GrapeName}\} \) with \( K_{\text{GRAPE}} = \{\text{GrapeName}\} \)
2. \( \text{ConsistsOf} = \{\text{GrapeName}, \text{WName}, \text{Amount}\} \) with \( K_{\text{ConsistsOf}} = \{\text{GrapeName}, \text{WName}\} \)
3. \( \text{WINE} = \{\text{Color}, \text{WName}, \text{Vintage}, \text{Res. Sugar}\} \) with \( K_{\text{WINE}} = \{\text{WName}\} \)

Attributes GrapeName and WName together are key
1:n Relationships

(Preliminary) transformation

- PRODUCER with the attributes Vineyard and Address,
- AREA with the attributes Name and Region, and
- LocatedIn with the attributes Vineyard and Name and the primary key of the n-side Vineyard as primary key of this schema.
Possible Merges

- **Optional relationships** ([0,1] or [0,n]) are not merged
- With cardinalities [1,1] or [1,n] (mandatory relationships), merge is possible:
  - 1:n relationship: the entity-relation schema of the n-side can be integrated into the relation schema of the relationship
  - 1:1 relationship: both entity-relation schemas can be integrated into the relation schema of the relationship
### 1:1 Relationships

- **(Preliminary) transformation**
  - PRODUCER with the attributes Vineyard and Address
  - LICENSE with the two attributes LicenseNo and Hectoliters
  - Has with the primary keys of both participating entity types each as key of this schema, that is LicenseNo and Vineyard
1:1 Relationships: Merge

Transformation with merge

- Merged relation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCER</th>
<th>Vineyard</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>LicenseNo</th>
<th>Hectoliters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotkäppchen</td>
<td>Freiberg</td>
<td>42-007</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Müller</td>
<td>Dagstuhl</td>
<td>42-009</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Producers without license require null values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCER</th>
<th>Vineyard</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>LicenseNo</th>
<th>Hectoliters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotkäppchen</td>
<td>Freiberg</td>
<td>42-007</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Müller</td>
<td>Dagstuhl</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Free Licenses lead to additional null values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCER</th>
<th>Vineyard</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>LicenseNo</th>
<th>Hectoliters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotkäppchen</td>
<td>Freiberg</td>
<td>42-007</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard Müller</td>
<td>Dagstuhl</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        |              |               | 42-003    | 100 000     |
Dependent Entity Types

Transformation

1. \( \text{WINEVINTAGE} = \{ \text{WName, Res. Sugar, Year} \} \) with \( K_{\text{WINEVINTAGE}} = \{ \{ \text{WName, Year} \} \} \)
2. \( \text{WINE} = \{ \text{Color, WName} \} \) with \( K_{\text{WINE}} = \{ \{ \text{WName} \} \} \)

- Attribute WName in WINEVINTAGE is foreign key to relation WINE
IS-A Relationship

Transformation

1. \( WINE = \{\text{Color}, \text{WName}, \text{Vintage}, \text{Res}\_\text{Sugar}\} \) with \( K_{WINE} = \{\{\text{WName}\}\} \)

2. \( \text{SPARKLING\_WINE} = \{\text{WName}, \text{Production}\} \) with \( K_{\text{SPARKLING\_WINE}} = \{\{\text{WName}\}\} \)

- WName in SPARKLING\_WINE is foreign key with respect to relation WINE
Recursive Relationships

Transformation

1. $\text{AREA} = \{\text{Name, Region}\}$ with $K_{\text{AREA}} = \{\{\text{Name}\}\}$
2. $\text{ADJOINS} = \{\text{to, from}\}$ with $K_{\text{ADJOINS}} = \{\{\text{to, from}\}\}$
Recursive Functional Relationships

Transformation

\[
\text{CRITIC} = \{\text{Name, Organization, Mentorname}\} \quad \text{with} \quad K_{\text{CRITIC}} = \{\{\text{Name}\}\}
\]

- Mentorname is foreign key to attribute Name of relation CRITIC.
Every participating entity type is treated according to the rules stated above.

For relationship `Recommends`, the primary keys of the three participating entity types are included in the resulting relation schema.

Relationship has a generic type (k:m:n relationship): all primary keys together form the key.
N-ary Relationships: Result

1. $\text{RECOMMENDS} = \{\text{WName}, \text{DName}, \text{Name}\}$ with $K_{\text{RECOMMENDS}} = \{\{\text{WName}, \text{DName}, \text{Name}\}\}$

2. $\text{DISH} = \{\text{DName}, \text{Side\_Dish}\}$ with $K_{\text{DISH}} = \{\{\text{DName}\}\}$

3. $\text{WINE} = \{\text{Color}, \text{WName}, \text{Vintage}, \text{Res\_Sugar}\}$ with $K_{\text{WINE}} = \{\{\text{WName}\}\}$

4. $\text{CRITIC} = \{\text{Name}, \text{Organization}\}$ with $K_{\text{CRITIC}} = \{\{\text{Name}\}\}$

The three key attributes of $\text{RECOMMENDS}$ are foreign keys to the respective source relations ($\text{CRITIC}$, $\text{WINE}$, $\text{DISH}$).
Overview of Transformations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ER Concept</th>
<th>Is Translated into Relational Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entity type $E_i$</td>
<td>Relation schema $R_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes of $E_i$</td>
<td>Attributes of $R_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary key $P_i$</td>
<td>Primary key $P_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship type</td>
<td>Relation schema $R_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its attributes</td>
<td>Attributes: $P_1$, $P_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 : n$</td>
<td>Further attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 : 1$</td>
<td>$P_2$ becomes primary key of the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m : n$</td>
<td>$P_1$ and $P_2$ become key of the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS-A relationship</td>
<td>$P_1 \cup P_2$ becomes primary key of the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_1$ gets an additional key $P_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$E_1$, $E_2$: Entity types participating in a relationship,
$P_1$, $P_2$: Their primary keys,
$1 : n$ relationship: $E_2$ is $n$-side,
IS-A relationship: $E_1$ is a special entity type
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Control Questions

- Which steps does the database design process comprise?
- Which requirements do the transformations between each design step have to fulfill? Why?
- How are concepts of the ER model translated into concepts of the relational model?
- How are the different cardinalities of relationship types accounted for during transformation?