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The Entity-Relationship model

- **Entity-Relationship data model** (ER model):
  - Proposed in 1976 in a paper by Peter Chen
  - **Graphical** notation for application modeling (ER diagrams)
  - Independent **semantic data model**
    (aiming at the meaning of concepts in real world)
  - Predecessor of today‘s object-oriented data models
  - Extremely successful as a means of „pre-design“ of relational DBs

- The ER model offers few very simple and basic **concepts**:

  - **Entities** (objects), characterized by **attributes** (properties)
  - Binary or n-ary **relationships** between entities,
    possibly characterized by attributes as well
  - Often not mentioned explicitly, but important and basic:
    **Values**: printable symbols as values of attributes;
    play a subordinate role (characterizing objects)
  - **Roles**: Names for the special meaning an entity has within a relationship
Each entity is completely characterized by the values of all its attributes.
Two similar entities


- **Identical attributes**: persNr, name, topic, rank
- **Partially different values**: firstName, age
Entity types

- **Similar** entities can be combined into **entity types**.

- „Similarity" requires at least **identical attribute structure**.
  (Attribute names and corresponding value domains are identical.)

- Entity types are graphically represented by **rectangles**. Attributes label the line connecting an entity type and a value domain (often symbolized by an **oval**):

```
Entity type:
- professor
- persNr: Int
- firstName: String
- name: String
- age: Int
- topic: String
- rank: String
```

**Name of the type**
Entity types: Alternative representations

- **Domain names** are often omitted (in case they are obvious or irrelevant). Instead attributes are placed inside ovals:

```
professor

persNr(firstName(name(age(topic(rank))))
```

- In larger diagrams, the attribute structure is often entirely omitted in order to save space (or is written down in abbreviated form only):

```
professor

persNr, firstName, name, . . .
```
Instances and population of an entity type

- Each entity "belongs to" at least one entity type:
  It is called an **instance** of this type.

- The set of all current instances of an entity type is called its current **population**.
• One and the same entity can be an instance of various entity types.

• In such a case, the attributes of the different types of this entity may well be quite different.
Classification in presence of identical attributes

- Entities with the same attributes do not at all have to be instances of the same type!

- Almost always additional classification criteria are required, usually not derivable from the attribute structure.
Key attributes

- As in the relational model (Access, SQL), there are usually one or more attributes per entity type the values of which are sufficient for uniquely identifying each instance:

- (Primary) key attributes are usually underlined in an ER-diagram.
- Keys ought to be "minimal" (no attribute can be omitted).
- A distinction between primary key and other candidate keys is not made in the ER-model, even though it would be useful to do so.
2nd main concept of the ER-model: elementary \textit{relationships} between two or more entities (possibly with their own attribute values)

- Each relationship is \textit{uniquely characterized} by the key values of the participating entities and by the values of all relationship attributes.

- However, there are \textit{no separate key attributes} for relationships, as the keys of the participating entities always suffice for unique identification.
Entitites may participate in various relationships (also similar ones).
• Similar relationships may be grouped into relationship types.

• „Similarity" requires at least identical attribute structure and identical types (and number) of participating entities.

• Relationship types are graphically denoted in the ER-model by a diamond. Attributes are written as for entity types.
Relationship types have instances, too: Individual relationships between individual entities are analogously considered *instances* of the corresponding R-type.
Type vs. instance

The distinction between types and instances is difficult even for specialists: Try to be precise from the very beginning!
• One and the same entity type may participate in a relationship type more than once, e.g.:

• For a (syntactical) distinction between the different „forms of participation“, special designators are used, called roles. Roles are used as labels of the lines connecting the resp. entity and relationship type.
Extended Geo-DB: ER-diagram

- **capital**
- **capital_of_country**
- **city**
- **city_in_country**
- **stadt_an_fluss**
- **river**
- **river_through_country**
- **source_of**
- **source_river**
- **region**
- **neighbour_country**
- **country 1**
- **country 2**
- **country**
- **region_in_country**
- **relationship type**
- **role**
- **entity type**
On the level of instances, a relation over the populations of the entity types involved is associated with each relationship type.
In many cases, at most one entity on one „side" of a relationship type may be associated with a particular entity on the other „side“ of the relationship, e.g.:

- Each city is in exactly one country.
- In each country, however, arbitrarily many cities may be situated.
• Mathematically, city_in_country is a function:

\[ \text{city_in_country: city } \rightarrow \text{ country} \]

• More exactly: . . . a function from the population of city into the population of country.
Functional relationships (3)

- In the ER-model, such restrictions of the admissible combinations can be expressed by means of so-called *functionalities*, annotations attached to the edges connecting entity and relationship types.

- There are four different kinds of *binary* relationships expressible by means of functionalities:

  - In this context, \( N \) resp. \( M \) stands for arbitrary integer values \( \geq 0 \).

- In the 'city_in_country'-example, an *N:1-relationship* is appropriate: There is exactly one country per city, but arbitrarily many cities per country (\( N \geq 0 \)).
- Functionalities of type 1 : 1, 1 : N or N : 1 define partial functions where some of the instances of the types involved possibly are not related at all.

- In the “normal“ ER-model, total functions cannot be distinguished from partial ones – in extensions of the model there are additional graphical means for explicitly stating whether a function is partial or total.
Functional relationships (5)

- In a 1 : 1-relationship each instance of one of the entity types involved is related to none or exactly one of the instances of the other entity type.

- An N : M-relationship can be considered the „normal case" without restrictions on the number of participating entities.

- If no functionalities have been stated for a relationship type, then an implicit N : M functionality is assumed.

- Functionalities can be defined for relationships with more than two entities involved, too:

```
R: E₁ × E₂ → E₃
```
Functional relationships (6)

- If in an n-ary relationship several edges are marked by '1',
  then the resp. relationship type represents several partial functions:

\[
\begin{align*}
R^{(1)}: & \quad E_1 \times E_2 \rightarrow E_3 \\
R^{(2)}: & \quad E_1 \times E_3 \rightarrow E_2
\end{align*}
\]

- \ldots and analogously:

\[
\begin{align*}
R^{(1)}: & \quad E_1 \times E_2 \rightarrow E_3 \\
R^{(2)}: & \quad E_1 \times E_3 \rightarrow E_2 \\
R^{(3)}: & \quad E_2 \times E_3 \rightarrow E_1
\end{align*}
\]
The concepts introduced so far have been contained in Chen‘s original proposal throughout. Since then, however, various extensions have been proposed: the Extended Entity-Relationship Model (EER-model).

Most important extensions (as in object-oriented models):

- formation of subtypes of entity types
- sub-/supertype relationships (type hierarchy)
- inheritance of attributes and of „participations" in R-types

Special graphical notation for generalization of E-types:
Generalization (2)

„Inheritance" in this example means:

- Both subtypes inherit all attributes of the supertype, i.e., they „own" these attributes without explicit definition.
- Both subtypes participate in the relationship type capital_of, which has been explicitly defined for the supertype only.
Generalization always means that the populations of the subtypes are subsets of the population of the supertype.

This circumstance motivates the notion 'is_a'-relationship:

"Every country is a region."

Quantifier over instances!
Generalization (4)

In the example: special case 
**disjoint generalization**
(Empty intersection of the populations)

In general:
This form of the 'is_a'-notation 
just means **some** form of 
subset formation, i.e. 
overlapping, incomplete 
subdivision.
Logical design: ER $\Rightarrow$ Relations
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1st step

Map ER types systematically to relations:
From semantic concepts to syntactic structures!
• Mapping from ER model to relational model:
  • in principle very easy: per type one relation (table)
  • in detail and for extensions: quite difficult

• Mapping of entity types: rather obvious
  • type \( \Rightarrow \) table name
  • attribute \( \Rightarrow \) column name

• Key attributes are mapped to primary key columns.
For relationship types:
- Use the same basic idea: one relation per type.
- **But**: How are participating entity types represented?

Obvious solution as well: The participating entities are represented by means of the values of their primary key attributes (possibly after renaming).
In presence of special functionalities (1 : N, N : 1, 1 : 1 resp.), a separate relationship table is not necessary, as the relationship information can be embedded into the table of the entity type on the N-side:

```
city
    +------+
    | name |
    |      |
    |      |
    +------+

state
    +------+
    | name |
    |      |
    |      |
    +------+

Foreign key
```

```markdown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>city.name</th>
<th>inhabitants</th>
<th>. . .</th>
<th>state.name</th>
<th>since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Relational representation of generalization hierarchies

How to realize inheritance and sub-/super type relationships relationally?

- Relational model: does not know any inheritance!
- Inheritance thus has to be "simulated".

Relational representation of a super type $E_1$ is obvious:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
E_1 \\
\hline
A_1 & A_2 & \ldots \\
\end{array}
$$
Relational representation of generalization hierarchies (2)

Inheritance

• **Obvious** relational realization of a subtype:
  subtype relation E₂ owns „native" and inherited attributes.

• **But**: Values of the inherited attributes of all E₂-instances have to be
  (redundantly) repeated in the E₁-relation in this case!

• **Reason**: Each E₂-instance is an E₁-instance, too!
Relational representation of generalization hierarchies (3)

Avoiding duplication: Store only „native“ attributes (+ key for joining) in the subtype relation!

But in this case relation $E_2$ does no longer contain all attributes of $E_1$-entities!
Relational representation of generalization hierarchies (4)

way out: E2-population is completely realized by means of a view joining the inherited and the native attributes.

CREATE VIEW E2-global AS
(SELECT *
FROM E1 INNER JOIN E2-local
Relational representation of generalization hierarchies (5)

3\textsuperscript{rd} alternative (also free of redundancies and using a view):
Distribute values of the \textit{inherited} attributes to \textit{different} relations – \textit{super types} are reconstructed via views.

CREATE VIEW \texttt{E1-global} AS
\begin{verbatim}
( TABLE \texttt{E1-local} )
UNION
(SELECT \texttt{A1, A2, ...}
FROM \texttt{E2})
\end{verbatim}
Which of the three alternatives is „the best“?

1. Relations $E_1$ and $E_2$, no views:
   - short access time (without any join of tables)
   - high requirements for space (due to redundant storage)

2. Relations $E_1$ and $E_2$-local, view $E_2$-global (JOIN):
   - Only key attribute values are stored redundantly.
   - Access to $E_2$-attributes is slower (due to join).

3. Relations $E_2$ and $E_1$-local, view $E_1$-global (PROJECT-UNION):
   - No duplication of any attribute values.
   - Access to $E_1$-attributes is slower (due to projection and union).
What happens if an E₂-entity is deleted?

- **relational variant 1** (inherited attributes duplicated):
  Deletion from both relations is necessary.

- **relational variant 2** (inherited and native A. separated):
  Deletion from both relations is necessary.

- **relational variant 3** (E₂-attributes only in one relation):
  no propagation of deletions required

⇒ In variants 1 and 2: referential integrity constraints with delete cascade is required.

- For insertions and modifications: Changes in several relations may be necessary, too (depending on the chosen strategy).

- Deletion of instances of the **super type** E₁: Cascading deletion if the resp. instance is an E₂-instance, too (again referential integrity).
Each relationship type induces FOREIGN KEY-constraints as well:

- With N : M-functionality:
  
  ```sql
  CREATE TABLE river_through_state
  ( River String REFERENCES river,
    State String REFERENCES state )
  ```

- With N : 1-functionality:
  
  ```sql
  CREATE TABLE city
  ( ...,
    State String REFERENCES state )
  ```
Functionalities as constraints

- **But:** **Uniqueness** of the state in the `city_in_state`-relationship has not yet been expressed!

- An **additional CHECK-constraint** is required constraining the number of state instances:

```
CREATE TABLE city
(...,
CHECK COUNT (SELECT State
FROM city S
WHERE S.Name = Name) <= 1
```

Implicit universal quantifier ranging over each city row!
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2nd step (after reaching relations):
Improve design by „fine tuning“ the structure of tables
Redundancies due to bad design

• Example of „bad design“ (remaining after mapping from ER level): 
  „City_in_state“ and „capital_of“ have been placed into a single table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köln</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essen</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trier</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Redundantly stored information:
Düsseldorf is the capital of North Rhine-Westphalia.

• Obviously one topic (Which city is the capital of . . . ?) has been combined with another topic (In which state is a certain city situated ?) in such an „unlucky“ manner that considerable redundancies occur, resulting in waste of space.

What does „a topic“ mean?
Anomalies resulting from redundancies

- An immediate consequence of such cases of storing multiple topics in one table is the occurrence of so-called **anomalies** when **updating** such tables:

  Assume Köln (as largest city in NW) replaces Düsseldorf as capital:
  
  **One fact changes, but multiple updates have to be made.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köln</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essen</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trier</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Analogous anomalies may happen due to **insertions** and **deletions**:
  - An instance of topic 1 disappears, as soon as it is no longer associated with any instance of topic 2.
  - A new instance of topic 1 can only be inserted, if it is combined with an instance of topic 2 (or null values are used).
Decompositions avoid redundancies and anomalies

How to prevent such „defects“ (anomalies, redundancies)?

In the example, there is a simple remedy:

Separate the two topics into different relations!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köln</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essen</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trier</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köln</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuss</td>
<td>NW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No redundancy, no anomaly!
Functional dependencies and decompositions

- Already discovered by Codd before 1970: Functional relationships between attributes are of help for finding meaningful decompositions and for avoiding redundancies!

- Resulting from this observation, Codd developed an elaborate theory of relational normal forms.

- Prerequisite: Designers identify such functional relationships during schema design (quite similar to identifying functionalities in the ER model) and express them as special integrity constraints.

- Principle of functional dependency:
  - Let A and B be attributes of a relation R.
  - B depends functionally on A, if in each state of R each A-value always occurs in combination with the same, uniquely determined B-value.
  - Symbolic notation: \( A \rightarrow B \)
FDs in the example

- Each city lies in **exactly one** state:  \( \text{City} \rightarrow \text{State} \)
- Each state has **exactly one** capital:  \( \text{State} \rightarrow \text{Capital} \)
- **But also**: If a city is a capital then it is the capital of **exactly one** state:  \( \text{Capital} \rightarrow \text{State} \)
- Each city is associated with **exactly one** capital (namely the capital of its state):  \( \text{City} \rightarrow \text{Capital} \)

![](image)

- **Decomposition separates FDs:**
  - One FD seems to be **lost**, however:  \( \text{City} \rightarrow \text{Capital} \)
"Codd's thesis"

• Thesis (claim) on which the normalization theory of Codd is based:

  Attributes connected via an FD represent semantically significant topics of the application domain.

• That is: Every FD identifies a topic – thus separating topics means separating FDs.

• But: Not every such topic is necessarily represented by an FD.

• Moreover: FD-connection is a sufficient, but not a necessary criterion for the existence of a 'topic'.

• Basic idea of Codd's approach to normalization of relations:
  Decompose relations in such a way that "normally" each FD has a component relation of its own. But try to identify exceptions where several FDs may "coexist" in one and the same relation!
Transitive FDs and Armstrong’s axioms

- There are FDs which are derivable from other FDs, already known. An important example are so-called *transitive* FDs:

  \[ \alpha \rightarrow \beta \]  

  is a **transitive** FD if there is an attribute set \( \gamma \), such that \( \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \) and \( \gamma \rightarrow \beta \) are both FDs, but not \( \gamma \rightarrow \alpha \).

- Every such transitive case leads to a (new) functional dependency.

- There are two other such *inference rules for FDs*, called the „Armstrong axioms“ (as they have been discovered by the Canadian scientist W. Armstrong).

  - **Every subset depends on its superset.**
    - \( \beta \subseteq \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha \rightarrow \beta \)

  - **Augmentation on both sides.**
    - \( \alpha \rightarrow \beta \Rightarrow \alpha \gamma \rightarrow \beta \gamma \)

- Not to be found in the literature, but quite useful: Special notion for FDs which are not transitive FDs:

  \[ \alpha \rightarrow \beta \]  

  is a **direct** FD if there is no attribute set \( \gamma \), such that \( \alpha \rightarrow \gamma \) and \( \gamma \rightarrow \beta \) are both FDs, but not \( \gamma \rightarrow \alpha \).
Normal forms

- Properly determining FDs and investigating their properties is the basis for each meaningful decomposition of relations into components free of redundancies.

  "Codd’s recepy" (in short from):
  Redundancies can be safely avoided if FDs always originate from candidate keys of a relation.

- Codd defined various degrees of FD separation, called normal forms – the process of transforming a given schema into relations all of which exhibit a given normal form is called normalization.

- The most important normal form is the third normal form (short: 3NF) defined as follows:

  A relation is in 3rd normal form ⇔
  Each non-key attribute functionally depends directly on each candidate key of the relation.

- There are various other normal forms (1NF, 2NF, 4NF and others).
Normalization in the example schema

- Our example schema from the geographic domain originally was not in 3NF, as it still contains a transitive dependency pointing from a candidate key (City) to a non-key attribute (Capital):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köln</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essen</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Düsseldorf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- After decomposition, however, each of the resulting component schemas is in 3NF! Such a decomposition will always be possible.

- The „lost“ dependency City → Capital can be reconstructed by means of the transitivity axiom of Armstrong.