## Databases – Conceptual to Relational Model

#### Jörg Endrullis

VU University Amsterdam

#### Translation :: Basic Translation

## From Conceptual to Relational Model

Basic idea

Entity sets and relationship sets are represented as tables.

#### Basic idea

Entity sets and relationship sets are represented as tables.

#### Roughly:

- one table for each entity set (name of the table is name of the entity set)
- one table for each relationship set (name of the table is name of the relationship set)
- columns roughly correspond to the attributes

## **Representing Entity Sets**

A strong entity set becomes



## **Representing Entity Sets**

#### A strong entity set becomes a table with

columns for the attributes



## **Representing Entity Sets**

#### A strong entity set becomes a table with

columns for the attributes



|           | Customer |        |              |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|----------|--------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| <u>id</u> | name     | street | city         |  |  |  |  |
| 1         | Smith    | North  | Pittsburgh   |  |  |  |  |
| 2         | Jones    | Alma   | Philadelphia |  |  |  |  |
| 3         | Brown    | Main   | New York     |  |  |  |  |
| 4         | Ford     | Main   | Washington   |  |  |  |  |

## **Representing Weak Entity Sets**



## **Representing Weak Entity Sets**

A weak entity set becomes a table that includes

- columns for the attributes, and
- columns for the primary keys of the identifying entity



## **Representing Weak Entity Sets**

A weak entity set becomes a table that includes

- columns for the attributes, and
- columns for the primary keys of the identifying entity



| Payment  |                |            |        |  |  |  |
|--|----------------|------------|--------|--|--|--|
| $\underline{\texttt{loan-number}} \to \texttt{Loan}$ | payment-number | date       | amount |  |  |  |
| L-11   | 1              | 19-05-2013 | 125    |  |  |  |
| L-14   | 2              | 01-02-2014 | 1000   |  |  |  |
| L-17   | 1              | 05-07-2012 | 50     |  |  |  |
| L-20   | 5              | 17-11-2013 | 750    |  |  |  |

## **Representing Relationship Sets**





## **Representing Relationship Sets**

A many-to-many relationship set becomes a table with

- columns for the attributes of the relationship set, and
- for the primary keys of the participating entity sets.



## **Representing Relationship Sets**

A many-to-many relationship set becomes a table with

- columns for the attributes of the relationship set, and
- for the primary keys of the participating entity sets.



| Borrower   |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| $\underline{\texttt{id}}  ightarrow \texttt{Customer}$ | $\underline{\texttt{loan-number}} \to \texttt{Loan}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 12-0202  | L-11   |  |  |  |  |
| 01-1823  | L-14   |  |  |  |  |
| 22-7361  | L-17   |  |  |  |  |
| 05-1912  | L-20   |  |  |  |  |

#### Translation :: Eliminating Tables

Many-to-(zero or)one relations can be represented by:



Many-to-(zero or)one relations can be represented by:

adding an extra extra attribute/column to the many-side with the primary key of the one-side



Many-to-(zero or)one relations can be represented by:

adding an extra extra attribute/column to the many-side with the primary key of the one-side



For example, instead of creating a table for the relationship set *depositor*, add a the attribute *id* of *customer* to *account*.

| Account                                     |                       |         |  |  |  |
|---|-----------------------|---------|--|--|--|
| $\texttt{id} \rightarrow \texttt{Customer}$ | <u>account-number</u> | balance |  |  |  |
| 12-0202                                     | 83828                 | 125     |  |  |  |
| 01-1823                                     | 29281                 | 1000    |  |  |  |

If participation is **partial** (0..1) then replacing the table by an attribute will result in **null values** for the entities that do not participate in the relationship set.

If participation is total (1..1), declare foreign key not null.

If participation is **partial** (0..1) then replacing the table by an attribute will result in **null values** for the entities that do not participate in the relationship set.

If participation is total (1..1), declare foreign key not null.

For **one-to-one** (0..1 or 1..1) relationship sets either side can be extended with the key of the other.

If participation is **partial** (0..1) then replacing the table by an attribute will result in **null values** for the entities that do not participate in the relationship set.

If participation is total (1..1), declare foreign key not null.

For **one-to-one** (0..1 or 1..1) relationship sets either side can be extended with the key of the other.

Tables for relationship sets linking **weak entity sets** to the identifying entity set can always be eliminated.

**No extra table is needed!** The table of the weak entity set already contains the key of the identifying entity set.

For instance the payment table already contains the full information that would appear in the loan-payment table (loan-number and payment-number).



**Basic translation** 



| <b>D</b> |         |        |          |
|----------|---------|--------|----------|
|          | n tra   | nnolo  | tion.    |
| DdS      | (, II c | 111516 | 111()[1] |
|          |         |        |          |

| Branch  |           | Account-of        |                  | Account |         |
|---------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|---------|---------|
| name    | city      | number            | name             | number  | balance |
| branch1 | Amsterdam | ightarrow Account | ightarrow Branch | 83828   | 125     |
| branch2 | Utrecht   | 83828             | branch1          | 29281   | 1000    |
|         |           | 29281             | branch2          |         |         |



|     |      |       | 1     |     |
|-----|------|-------|-------|-----|
| 200 | 10 t | rnnn  | Intin | n   |
| DdS |      | 14115 | Idiio |     |
|     |      |       |       | ••• |

| Branch  |           | Account-of        |                  | Account |         |
|---------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|---------|---------|
| name    | city      | number            | name             | number  | balance |
| branch1 | Amsterdam | ightarrow Account | ightarrow Branch | 83828   | 125     |
| branch2 | Utrecht   | 83828             | branch1          | 29281   | 1000    |
|         |           | 29281             | branch2          |         |         |

Optimised translation



| <b>D</b> |        |       |      |
|----------|--------|-------|------|
|          | in tra | nolo  | tion |
| DdS      |        | 11510 |      |
|          |        |       |      |

| Branch  |           | Account-of        |                  | Account |         |
|---------|-----------|-------------------|------------------|---------|---------|
| name    | city      | number            | name             | number  | balance |
| branch1 | Amsterdam | ightarrow Account | ightarrow Branch | 83828   | 125     |
| branch2 | Utrecht   | 83828             | branch1          | 29281   | 1000    |
|         |           | 29281             | branch2          |         |         |

#### **Optimised translation**

| Br      | Branch Account |  |   |        |         |
|---------|----------------|--|---|--------|---------|
| name    | city           |  | $\textbf{name} \rightarrow \textbf{Branch}$ | number | balance |
| branch1 | Amsterdam      |  | branch1                                     | 83828  | 125     |
| branch2 | Utrecht        |  | branch2                                     | 29281  | 1000    |

#### Translation :: Cardinalities and Constraints

When translating entity sets and relationship sets to tables:

- every table should have a primary key (if possible)
- declared foreign key constraints for each relation

When translating entity sets and relationship sets to tables:

- every table should have a primary key (if possible)
- declared foreign key constraints for each relation

Foreign keys should be declared

- not null, or not,
- unique, or not,

to model the cardinality limits as good as possible.

When translating entity sets and relationship sets to tables:

- every table should have a primary key (if possible)
- declared foreign key constraints for each relation

Foreign keys should be declared

- not null, or not,
- unique, or not,

to model the cardinality limits as good as possible.

All columns in tables from relationship sets are not nullable. Each row is a relationship among all participating entity sets.

When translating entity sets and relationship sets to tables:

- every table should have a primary key (if possible)
- declared foreign key constraints for each relation

Foreign keys should be declared

- not null, or not,
- unique, or not,

to model the cardinality limits as good as possible.

All columns in tables from relationship sets are not nullable. Each row is a relationship among all participating entity sets.

Attributes should be declared **not null** and/or **unique** if appropriate.

Which min/max cardinalities can be enforced and how?

A 0..\* to 0..\* B:

- A 0..1 to 0..\* B:
- A 1..1 to 0...\* B:
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B:
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A *M*..*N* to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B:
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B:
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B:
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B:
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B:
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B:
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B:
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B:
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B:
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B:
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B:
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B:
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:
- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B:
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes Add key of A (or B) as foreign key to B (or A)
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes Add key of A (or B) as foreign key to B (or A) with constraint unique.
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B:
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes Add key of A (or B) as foreign key to B (or A) with constraint unique.
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B: yes
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes Add key of A (or B) as foreign key to B (or A) with constraint unique.
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B: yes Add key of B as foreign key to A
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B:
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

Which min/max cardinalities can be enforced and how?

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes Add key of A (or B) as foreign key to B (or A) with constraint unique.
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B: yes Add key of B as foreign key to A with constraints unique & not null.

A 1..1 to 1..1 B:

A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes Add key of A (or B) as foreign key to B (or A) with constraint unique.
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B: yes Add key of B as foreign key to A with constraints unique & not null.
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B: yes
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes Add key of A (or B) as foreign key to B (or A) with constraint unique.
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B: yes Add key of B as foreign key to A with constraints unique & not null.
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B: yes Join tables of A and B.
- A M..N to 1..\* B:

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes Add key of A (or B) as foreign key to B (or A) with constraint unique.
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B: yes Add key of B as foreign key to A with constraints unique & not null.
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B: yes Join tables of A and B.
- A M..N to 1..\* B: no

- A 0..\* to 0..\* B: yes A separate relationship set table.
- A 0..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B.
- A 1..1 to 0..\* B: yes Add key of A as foreign key to B with constraint not null.
- A 0..1 to 0..1 B: yes Add key of A (or B) as foreign key to B (or A) with constraint unique.
- A 0..1 to 1..1 B: yes Add key of B as foreign key to A with constraints unique & not null.
- A 1..1 to 1..1 B: yes Join tables of A and B.
- A M..N to 1..\* B: no Workaround: approximate the cardinality limit 1..\* with 0..\*.

### Translation :: Composite & Multi-Valued Attributes

### **Composite Attributes**



**Composite attributes** are **flattened out** by creating a separate column for each component attribute.



**Composite attributes** are **flattened out** by creating a separate column for each component attribute.



| Customer |            |                |           |  |  |  |
|----------|------------|----------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| id       | first-name | middle-initial | last-name |  |  |  |
| 1        | James      | null           | Smith     |  |  |  |
| 2        | Joe        | J              | Jones     |  |  |  |
| 3        | Jack       | F              | Brown     |  |  |  |
| 4        | Harrison   | null           | Ford      |  |  |  |

### **Multi-Valued Attributes**

Multi-valued attribute A of an entity set E is represented by



### **Multi-Valued Attributes**

**Multi-valued attribute** *A* of an entity set *E* is represented by a **separate table** with:

- columns for the primary key of E, and
- a column for the attribute value

Each single value of the multi-valued attributes gets its own row.



### **Multi-Valued Attributes**

**Multi-valued attribute** *A* of an entity set *E* is represented by a **separate table** with:

- columns for the primary key of E, and
- a column for the attribute value

Each single value of the multi-valued attributes gets its own row.



| Customer       |         |  |  |
|----------------|---------|--|--|
| <u>id</u> name |         |  |  |
| 1              | 1 Smith |  |  |
| 2              | 2 Jones |  |  |
| 3 Brown        |         |  |  |
| 4 Ford         |         |  |  |

| Phone-number  |               |  |  |  |
|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| $\underline{\texttt{id}} \rightarrow \texttt{Customer}$ | <u>number</u> |  |  |  |
| 1   | 06-19348472   |  |  |  |
| 1   | 0346-928475   |  |  |  |
| 3   | 06-13783933   |  |  |  |
| 3   | 0238-187333   |  |  |  |
| 3   | 0192-937189   |  |  |  |

#### Translation :: ISA





Method 1: hierarchy of tables

- a table for the higher-level entity set
- a table for each lover-level entity set; include primary key of higher-level entity set and local attributes



Minor drawback: requires accessing multiple tables.



#### Method 2: many tables

Form a table for each entity set with all local and inherited attributes.

| Employee |       |        | Customer                   |       |    |
|----------|-------|--------|----------------------------|-------|----|
| id       | name  | salary | <u>id</u> name credit-rati |       |    |
| 1        | James | 4000   | 2                          | Jones | 42 |

Typically, we also need a table for person, but...

#### Method 2: many tables

Form a table for each entity set with all local and inherited attributes.

**If specialisation is total** then we need no table for the generalised entity (*person*):

#### Method 2: many tables

Form a table for each entity set with all local and inherited attributes.

**If specialisation is total** then we need no table for the generalised entity (*person*):

Table for the **generalised entity set** can be defined **as a view** containing the union of the specialisation tables

#### Method 2: many tables

Form a table for each entity set with all local and inherited attributes.

**If specialisation is total** then we need no table for the generalised entity (*person*):

Table for the **generalised entity set** can be defined **as a view** containing the union of the specialisation tables

#### Drawback:

- explicit table for the generalised entity might be needed for foreign key constraints.
- attributes are stored redundantly if an entity belongs to several specialised entity sets (overlapping ISA)
  - e.g. name and address are stored multiple times for someone who is customer and employee



Method 3: one table with null values

From a single table with all local and specialised attributes.

|    | Person                       |      |      |  |  |  |  |
|----|------------------------------|------|------|--|--|--|--|
| id | id name salary credit-rating |      |      |  |  |  |  |
| 1  | James                        | 4000 | null |  |  |  |  |
| 2  | Jones                        | null | 42   |  |  |  |  |



Method 3: one table with null values

From a single table with all local and specialised attributes.

| Person |                              |      |      |  |  |  |  |
|--------|------------------------------|------|------|--|--|--|--|
| id     | id name salary credit-rating |      |      |  |  |  |  |
| 1      | James                        | 4000 | null |  |  |  |  |
| 2      | Jones                        | null | 42   |  |  |  |  |

Advantage: no joins

**Drawback:** null values for non-applicable attributes *For instance, salary will be null for customers.* 

### Translation :: Primary Keys

| Customer                               |       |             |        |        |  |  |  |
|--|-------|-------------|--------|--------|--|--|--|
| first-name last-name phone street city |       |             |        |        |  |  |  |
| Tom                                    | James | 06-73917384 | Main   | London |  |  |  |
| Joe                                    | Jones | 06-18384405 | Slater | Paris  |  |  |  |

What would be a good primary key?

| Customer                               |       |             |        |        |  |  |  |  |
|--|-------|-------------|--------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| first-name last-name phone street city |       |             |        |        |  |  |  |  |
| Tom                                    | James | 06-73917384 | Main   | London |  |  |  |  |
| Joe                                    | Jones | 06-18384405 | Slater | Paris  |  |  |  |  |

What would be a good primary key?

Is { first-name, last-name, phone } a good key?

| Customer                               |       |             |        |        |  |  |  |  |
|--|-------|-------------|--------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| first-name last-name phone street city |       |             |        |        |  |  |  |  |
| Tom                                    | James | 06-73917384 | Main   | London |  |  |  |  |
| Joe                                    | Jones | 06-18384405 | Slater | Paris  |  |  |  |  |

What would be a good primary key?

- Is { first-name, last-name, phone } a good key?
  - the phone number can change
  - is it really unique?

| Customer                               |       |             |        |        |  |  |  |
|--|-------|-------------|--------|--------|--|--|--|
| first-name last-name phone street city |       |             |        |        |  |  |  |
| Tom                                    | James | 06-73917384 | Main   | London |  |  |  |
| Joe                                    | Jones | 06-18384405 | Slater | Paris  |  |  |  |

What would be a good primary key?

- Is { first-name, last-name, phone } a good key?
  - the phone number can change
  - is it really unique?

It is often good to introduce an artificial internal key:

- e.g. customer-id
- advantage: unique, does not change
- minor disadvantage: no descriptive meaning

### Translation :: Recursive Relations









This diagram is wrong since a manager is an employee as well.

### **Recursive Relations**

The correct way is to use a recursive relation:


## **Recursive Relations**

The correct way is to use a recursive relation:



A **recursive relation** translates to a foreign key that refers to the same table.

| Employee  |          |          |        |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|----------|----------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| <u>id</u> | name     | jobTitle | salary | ${	t supervisedBy}  ightarrow {	t id}$ |  |  |  |
| 1         | James    |          |        | 2                                      |  |  |  |
| 2         | Harrison |          |        | null                                   |  |  |  |

## **Recursive Relations**

The correct way is to use a recursive relation:



A **recursive relation** translates to a foreign key that refers to the same table.

| Employee  |          |          |        |  |  |  |  |
|-----------|----------|----------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| <u>id</u> | name     | jobTitle | salary | ${	t supervisedBy}  ightarrow {	t id}$ |  |  |  |
| 1         | James    |          |        | 2                                      |  |  |  |
| 2         | Harrison |          |        | null                                   |  |  |  |

A **recursive many-to-many relation** requires a separate table with two foreign keys to the parent table (the usual translation).

## **Recursive Relations**

The following diagram is also correct:



Can be translated as:



If the manager has no additional attributes, then it is better to eliminate the table (translation as on the last slide).