
# *The Entity-Relationship (ER) Model*

(Study Cow book Chapter 2)

# *Overview of Database Design*



- *Conceptual design*: *(ER Model is used at this stage.)*
  - What are the *entities* and *relationships* in the enterprise?
  - What information about these entities and relationships should we store in the database?
  - What are the *integrity constraints* or *business rules* that hold?
  - A database "model" can be represented pictorially (*ER diagrams*).
  - Can map an ER diagram into a relational schema.

# *ER Modeling and ER Diagrams*



- *Entity:* An object distinguishable from other objects. Entities are characterized by a set of *attributes*.
- *Entity Set*: A collection of similar entities. E.g., all employees.
  - All entities in an entity set have the same set of attributes. (Until we consider ISA hierarchies, anyway!)
  - Each entity set has a *key*.
  - Each attribute has a *domain*.






# ER Model Basics






- *Relationship*: Association among two or more entities. e.g., David works in the Math department.
- *Relationship Set*: Collection of similar relationships.
  - An *n-ary* relationship set, ***R***, relates n entity sets E1 ... En; each relationship in ***R*** involves entities $\{(e_1, \ldots, e_n) \mid e_1 \in E_1, \cdots, e_n \in E_n\}$
  - Same entity set could participate in different relationship sets, or in different "roles" in same set.



# *Key Constraints*



- Consider Works_In: An employee can work in many departments; a dept can have many employees.
- In contrast, each dept has at most one manager, according to the *key constraint* on Manages.






# *Participation Constraints*



- Must every department have a manager?
  - If so, this is a *participation constraint*: the participation of Departments in Manages is said to be *total* (vs. *partial*).
  - Every Departments entity must appear in an instance of the Manages relationship, which relates each department to the employee who manages it.



# *Weak Entities*



- A *weak entity* can be identified uniquely only by considering the primary key of another (*owner*) entity.
  - Owner entity set and weak entity set must participate in a one-to-many relationship set (one owner, many weak entities).
  - Weak entity set must have total participation in this *identifying* relationship set.



# *ISA ('is a') Hierarchies*



- It is often useful to subdivide entities into classes, like in an OOL
- If we declare A **ISA** B, every A entity is also considered to be a B entity.




- *Overlap constraints*: Can Joe be an Hourly_Emps as well as a Contract_Emps entity? (*Allowed/disallowed*)
- *Covering constraints*: Does every Employees entity also have to be an Hourly_Emps or a Contract_Emps entity? (*Yes/no*)
- Reasons for using ISA:
  - To add descriptive attributes specific to a subclass.
  - To identify entitities that participate in a relationship.

# *Aggregation*



- Used when we have to model a relationship involving (entitity sets and) a *relationship set*.
  - *Aggregation* allows a relationship set to be treated as an entity set for purposes of participation in (other) relationships.




☛ *Aggregation vs. ternary relationship*:

- Monitors is a distinct relationship, with a descriptive attribute.
- Each sponsorship is monitored by at most one employee.

# *Conceptual Design Using the ER Model*



- Design choices:
  - Should a concept be modeled as an entity or an attribute?
  - Should a concept be modeled as an entity or a relationship?
  - Identifying relationships: Binary or ternary? Aggregation?
- Constraints in the ER Model:
  - A lot of data semantics can (and should) be captured.
  - But some constraints cannot be captured in ER diagrams.

# *Entity vs. Attribute*



- Should *address* be an attribute of Employees or an entity (connected to Employees by a relationship)?
- Depends upon the use we want to make of address information, and the semantics of the data:
  - If we have several addresses per employee, *address* must be an entity (since attributes cannot themselves be sets (multivalued)).
  - If the structure (city, street, etc.) is important, e.g., we want to retrieve employees in a given city, *address* must be modeled as an entity (since attribute values are atomic).

# *Entity vs. Attribute (Contd.)*



- Works_In4 does not allow an employee to work in a department for two or more periods.




- Similar to the problem of wanting to record several addresses for an employee: We want to record *several values of the descriptive attributes for each instance of this relationship.* Accomplished by introducing new entity set, Duration.





# *Entity vs. Relationship*

- First ER diagram OK if a manager gets a separate discretionary budget for each dept.
- What if a manager gets a discretionary budget that covers *all* managed depts?
  - Redundancy: *dbudget* stored for each dept managed by manager.
  - Misleading: Suggests *dbudget* associated with department-mgr combination.







This fixes the problem!

# *Binary vs. Ternary Relationships*



- If each policy is owned by just 1 employee, and each dependent is tied to the covering policy, first diagram is inaccurate.
- What are the additional constraints in the 2nd diagram?




Bad design




Better design

# *Binary vs. Ternary Relationships (Contd.)*

- Previous example illustrated a case when two binary relationships were better than one ternary relationship.
- An example in the other direction: a ternary relation Contracts relates entity sets Parts, Departments and Suppliers, and has descriptive attribute *qty*. No combination of binary relationships is an adequate substitute:
  - S "can-supply" P, D "needs" P, and D "deals-with" S does not imply that D has agreed to buy P from S.
  - Where do we record *qty*?

# *Summary of Conceptual Design*



- *Conceptual design* follows *requirements analysis*,
  - Yields a high-level description of data to be stored
- ER model popular for conceptual design
  - Constructs are expressive, close to the way people think about their applications.
- Basic constructs: *entities*, *relationships*, and *attributes* (of entities and relationships).
- Some additional constructs: *weak entities*, *ISA hierarchies*, and *aggregation*.
- Note: There are many variations on ER model.

# *Summary of ER (Contd.)*



- Several kinds of integrity constraints can be expressed in the ER model: *key constraints*, *participation constraints*, and *overlap/covering constraints* for ISA hierarchies. Some *foreign key constraints* are also implicit in the definition of a relationship set.
  - Some constraints (notably, *functional dependencies*) cannot be expressed in the ER model.
  - Constraints play an important role in determining the best database design for an enterprise.

# *Summary of ER (Contd.)*



- ER design is *subjective*. There are often many ways to model a given scenario! Analyzing alternatives can be tricky, especially for a large enterprise. Common choices include:
  - Entity vs. attribute, entity vs. relationship, binary or n-ary relationship, whether or not to use ISA hierarchies, and whether or not to use aggregation.
- Ensuring good database design: resulting relational schema should be analyzed and refined further. FD information and normalization techniques are especially useful.

# *Next Time*



- The Relational Model