Week 10: Database Design

Database Design
From an ER Schema to a Relational One
Restructuring an ER Schema
Performance Analysis
Analysis of Redundancies, Removing Generalizations
Translation into a Relational Schema

(Relational) Database Design

- Given a conceptual schema (ER, but could also be a UML), generate a logical (relational) schema.
- This is not just a simple translation from one model to another for two main reasons:
  - Not all the constructs of the Entity-Relationship model can be translated naturally into the relational model;
  - The schema must be restructured in such a way as to make the execution of the projected operations as efficient as possible.
- The topic is covered in Section 3.5 of the textbook.

Designing a Database Schema
Logical Design Steps
- It is helpful to divide the design into two steps:
  - Restructuring of the Entity-Relationship schema, based on criteria for the optimization of the schema and the simplification of the following step;
  - Translation into the logical model, based on the features of the logical model (in our case, the relational model).

Performance Analysis
- An ER schema is restructured to optimize:
  - Cost of an operation (evaluated in terms of the number of occurrences of entities and relationships that are visited during the execution of an operation);
  - Storage requirements (evaluated in terms of number of bytes necessary to store the data described by the schema).
- In order to study these parameters, we need to know:
  - Projected volume of data;
  - Projected operation characteristics.

Cost Model
- The cost of an operation is measured in terms of the number of disk accesses required. A disk access is, generally, orders of magnitude more expensive than in-memory accesses, or CPU operations.
- For a coarse estimate of cost, we assume that:
  - A Read operation (for one entity or relationship) requires 1 disk access;
  - A Write operation (for one entity or relationship) requires 2 disk accesses (read from disk, change, write back to disk).
- There are many other cost models depending on use and type of DB:
  - Warehouse (OLAP - On-Line Analysis Processing)
  - Operational DB (OLTP - On-Line Transaction Processing)
Typical Operations

- Operation 1: Assign an employee to a project.
- Operation 2: Find an employee record, including her department, and the projects she works for.
- Operation 3: Find records of employees for a department.
- Operation 4: For each branch, retrieve its departments, and for each department, retrieve the last names of their managers, and the list of their employees.
- Need operations and their volume/frequency

Workload Design

- During initial design and requirements analysis
  - Estimate operations and frequency
  - Gross estimates at best
- After database is operational
  - Tools record actual workload characteristics

Analysis of Redundancies

- A redundancy in a conceptual schema corresponds to a piece of information that can be derived (that is, obtained through a series of retrieval operations) from other data in the database.
- An Entity-Relationship schema may contain various forms of redundancy.
Deciding About Redundancies

- The presence of a redundancy in a database may be
  - an advantage: a reduction in the number of accesses necessary to obtain the derived information;
  - a disadvantage: because of larger storage requirements, (but, usually at negligible cost) and the necessity to carry out additional operations in order to keep the derived data consistent.

The decision to maintain or eliminate a redundancy is made by comparing the cost of operations that involve the redundant information and the storage needed, in the case of presence or absence of redundancy.

Cost Comparison: An Example

In this schema the attribute `NumberOfInhabitants` is redundant.

Removing Generalizations

- The relational model does not allow direct representation of generalizations that may be present in an E-R diagram.
- For example, here is an ER schema with generalizations:
Possible Restructurings

Option 1

Note!

Option 2

Option 3

Option 4 (combination)

General Rules For Removing Generalization

- Option 1 is convenient when the operations involve the occurrences and the attributes of E₀, E₁, and E₂ more or less in the same way.
- Option 2 is possible only if the generalization satisfies the coverage constraint (i.e., every instance of E₀ is either an instance of E₁ or E₂) and is useful when there are operations that apply only to occurrences of E₁ or E₂.
- Option 3 is useful when the generalization is not coverage-compliant and the operations refer to either occurrences and attributes of E₁ (E₂) or of E₀, and therefore make distinctions between child and parent entities.
- Available options can be combined (see option 4)

Partitioning and Merging of Entities and Relationships

- Entities and relationships of an E-R schema can be partitioned or merged to improve the efficiency of operations, using the following principle:
  
  Accesses are reduced by separating attributes of the same concept that are accessed by different operations and by merging attributes of different concepts that are accessed by the same operations.

- The same criteria with those discussed for redundancies are valid in making a decision about this type of restructuring.
Example of Partitioning

Recall this is a weak entity

Deletion of Multi-Valued Attribute

Merging Entities

Two candidate keys

Partitioning of a Relationship

Suppose that composition represents current and past compositions of a team

Are these equivalent?
Selecting a Primary Key

- Every relation must have a unique primary key.
- The criteria for this decision are as follows:
  - Attributes with null values cannot form primary keys;
  - One/few attributes is preferable to many attributes;
  - Internal key preferable to external ones (weak entity);
  - A key that is used by many operations to access the instances of an entity is preferable to others.
- At this stage, if none of the candidate keys satisfies the above requirements, it may be best to introduce a new attribute (e.g., Social)

Translation into a Logical Schema

- The second step of logical design consists of a translation between different data models.
- Starting from an E-R schema, an equivalent relational schema is constructed. By “equivalent”, we mean a schema capable of representing the same information.
- We will deal with the translation problem systematically, beginning with the fundamental case, that of entities linked by many-to-many relationships.

Many-to-Many Relationships

- Employee(Number, Surname, Salary)
- Project(Code, Name, Budget)
- Participation(Number, Code, StartDate)

Many-to-Many Recursive Relationships

- Product(Code, Name, Cost)
- Composition(Part, SubPart, Quantity)
Ternary Relationships

Supplier(SupplierID, SupplierName)
Product(Code, Type)
Department(Name, Telephone)
Supply(Supplier, Product, Department, Quantity)

One-to-Many Relationships

Player(Surname, DateOfBirth, Position)
Team(Name, Town, TeamColours)
Contract(PlayerSurname, PlayerDateOfBirth, Team, Salary)

OR

Player(Surname, DateOfBirth, Position, TeamName, Salary)
Team(Name, Town, TeamColours)

Weak Entities

Student(RegistrationNumber, University, Surname, EnrolmentYear)
University(Name, Town, Address)

One-to-One Relationships

Head(Number, Name, Salary, Department, StartDate)
Department(Name, Telephone, Branch)

OR

Head(Number, Name, Salary, StartDate)
Department(Name, Telephone, HeadNumber, Branch)
Optional One-to-One Relationships

Employee(Number, Name, Salary)
Department(Name, Telephone, Branch, Head, StartDate)

Or, if both entities are optional
Employee(Number, Name, Salary)
Department(Name, Telephone, Branch)
Management(Head, Department, StartDate)

A Sample ER Schema

Entities with Internal Identifiers

1-1 and Optional 1-1 Relationships

1-1 or optional 1-1 relationships can lead to messy transformations
### Weak Entities

- **E1**: \( (A_{11}, A_{51}, A_{12}) \)
- **E2**: \( (A_{21}, A_{11}, A_{51}, A_{22}) \)
- **E3**: \( (A_{31}, A_{32}) \)
- **E4**: \( (A_{41}, A_{42}) \)
- **E5**: \( (A_{51}, A_{52}, A_{61}, A_{62}, A_{R3}, A_{R4}, A_{R5}) \)
- **E6**: \( (A_{61}, A_{62}, A_{63}) \)

### Many-to-Many Relationships

- **R1**: \( (A_{11}, A_{31}, A_{41}) \)
- **R2**: \( (A_{21}, A_{31}, A_{41}, A_{R21}, A_{R22}) \)
- **R3**: \( (A_{R3}, A_{R4}, A_{R5}) \)
- **R4**: \( (A_{R4}, A_{R5}) \)
- **R5**: \( (A_{R5}) \)
- **R6**: \( (A_{61}, A_{62}) \)

### Summary of Transformation Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Initial schema</th>
<th>Possible translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Binary many-to-many relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 ( \rightarrow ) E2 ( \rightarrow ) R1 ( \rightarrow ) E3</td>
<td>E1 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{21} )  A21 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{31} )  A31 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{41} )</td>
<td>E1 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{21} )  E2 ( A_{21} \rightarrow A_{31} )  E3 ( A_{31} \rightarrow A_{41} )  R1 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{21} )  A21 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{31} )  A31 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{41} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binary many-to-many relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 ( \rightarrow ) E2 ( \rightarrow ) R2 ( \rightarrow ) E3</td>
<td>E1 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{21} )  A21 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{31} )  A31 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{41} )</td>
<td>E1 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{21} )  E2 ( A_{21} \rightarrow A_{31} )  E3 ( A_{31} \rightarrow A_{41} )  R2 ( A_{21} \rightarrow A_{31} )  A31 ( A_{21} \rightarrow A_{41} )  A41 ( A_{21} \rightarrow A_{41} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-to-many relationship with mandatory participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 ( \rightarrow ) E2 ( \rightarrow ) R3 ( \rightarrow ) E3</td>
<td>E1 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{21} )  A21 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{31} )  A31 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{41} )</td>
<td>E1 ( A_{11} \rightarrow A_{21} )  E2 ( A_{21} \rightarrow A_{31} )  E3 ( A_{31} \rightarrow A_{41} )  R3 ( A_{R3} \rightarrow A_{R4} )  A41 ( A_{R3} \rightarrow A_{R4} )  A51 ( A_{R3} \rightarrow A_{R4} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...More Rules...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Initial schema</th>
<th>Possible translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-to-many relationship with optional participation</td>
<td>$E_1 \rightarrow A_{E1}$, $A_{E1} \rightarrow A_{E2}$</td>
<td>$E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with external identifiers</td>
<td>$E_1 \rightarrow A_{E1}, A_{E2}$</td>
<td>$E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...Even More Rules...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Initial schema</th>
<th>Possible translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one relationship with mandatory participation for both entities</td>
<td>$E_1 \rightarrow A_{E1}$, $A_{E1} \rightarrow A_{E2}$</td>
<td>$E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one relationship with optional participation for one entity</td>
<td>$E_1 \rightarrow A_{E1}$, $A_{E1} \rightarrow A_{E2}$</td>
<td>$E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...and the Last One...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Initial schema</th>
<th>Possible translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one relationship with optional participation for both entities</td>
<td>$E_1 \rightarrow A_{E1}$, $A_{E1} \rightarrow A_{E2}$</td>
<td>$E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$ $E(A_{E1}, A_{E2})$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Training Company Revisited
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Logical Design Using CASE Tools

- The logical design phase is partially supported by database design tools:
  - the translation to the relational model is carried out by such tools semi-automatically;
  - the restructuring step is difficult to automate and CASE tools provide little or no support for it.
- Most commercial CASE tools will generate automatically SQL code for the creation of the database.
- Some tools allow direct connection with a DBMS and can construct the corresponding database automatically.
- \textit{[CASE = Computer-Aided Software Engineering]}