

| Schemas and Attributes | NULL Values | |
|--|--|--|
| Relation schema A relation name R and a list of attributes A1, A2,, An | Each domain may be augmented with a special value called NULL Represent the values of attributes that may be unknown or may not apply to a tunle | |
| • Denoted by <i>R</i> (<i>A</i> 1, <i>A</i> 2,, <i>An</i>) | If an attribute of a tuple is NULL, we cannot make any assumption about the value for that attribute (for that tuple) | |
| Attribute Ai | Interpretations for NULL values Nothing is known about the value | |
| • Name of a role in the relation schema <i>R</i> | | |
| Associated with a domain dom(A) Attribute names do not repeat within a relation | Value exists but is (currently) not available | |
| schema, but domains can repeat | Value undefined (i.e., attribute does not apply to this tuple) | |
| | For instance, Ashley's telephone number is NULL could mean | |
| Degree (or arity) of a relation | Ashley doesn't have a phone Ashley has a phone but we don't know the number (perhaps withheld) | |
| • Number of attributes <i>n</i> in its relation schema | Ashley has a phone but we don't know the humber (perhaps withheit) Ashley has a phone that has no number | |
| LINKÖPING Database Technology UNVERSITY Topic 2: Relational Databases 7 | UNIVERSITY Database Technology Topic 2: Relational Databases 8 | |
| | What are Integrity Constraints? | |
| | Restrictions on the nermitted values in a database instance / state | |
| | Derived from the rules in the miniworld that the DB represents | |
| | 1 Inhorent model based constraints (also called implicit constraints) | |
| | Inherent in the data model, enforced by DBMS | |
| Integrity Constraints | • e.g., duplicate tuples are not allowed in a relation | |
| | 2. Schema-based constraints (also called explicit constraints) | |
| | Can be expressed in schemas of the data model, enforced by DBMS | |
| | Our focus here | |
| | 3. Application-based (also semantic constraints or business rules) | |
| | Not directly expressed in schemas | |
| | Expressed and enforced by application program e.g., this year's salary increase can be no more than last year's | |
| | | |
| | UNIVERSITY Topic 2: Relational Databases 10 | |
| Uniqueness Constraints | Superkeys and Candidate Keys | |
| Let R be a relation and K be a (sub)set of attributes of R | • A set <i>K</i> of attributes of <i>R</i> is called a <i>superkey</i> of R if it has the | |
| If we specify the uniqueness constraint for K, then for any | Uniqueness property: no two distinct tuples have the same | |
| pair of tuples in <i>R</i> , the tuples must have a different value for at least one of the attributes in <i>K</i> | values across all attributes in <i>K</i> (i.e., we may define a uniqueness constraint for <i>K</i>) | |
| Uniqueness must hold in all valid instances of R | K is called a key of R if, additionally, it also has the | |
| Uniqueness serves as a constraint on updates | Minimality property: no proper subset of <i>K</i> has the uniqueness property | |
| Student Grade | Hence, every key is a superkey, but not every superkey is a key | |
| PN FName LName Course StPN Grade | "candidate key" - key | |
| 19951223-6512 Paul Smith TDDD17 19970218-1782 4 | used, in particular, if multiple different kevs are possible | |
| 19990721-1222 Kim Jonsson TDDD43 19951223-6512 3 | | |
| LINKOPING Database Technology UNIVERDITY Database Technology | LINKOPING Database Technology LINKOPINT/ Tenics to indefendent landscare | |
| Topic 3: Belational Databases 11 | I TODIC 2' Relational Databases 12 | |

| Primary Key | | | | | Other Schema-Based Integrity Constraints | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------|-------|---|--|--|
| There may be more than one condidete key in a relation | | | | | Entity integrity constraint: No primary key yoluo can be NUU | | |
| Primary key | narticular cand | lidate kev is chos | as the nrim | arv | | | |
| Diagrammatic | ally underline it | s attribute(s) | in as the phili | | Domain constraint: declared by specifying the datatype (domain) of the attributes | | |
| Tuples cannot | have NULL for | any primary key a | attribute | | | | |
| Other candidate | e keys are desiç | gnated as unique | | | Referential integrity constraint | | |
| • Non-NULL val | ues cannot repe | eat, but values ma | y be NULL | | • see next slides | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Person1 | Namo | Person2 | Namo | | | | |
| PN 19970218-1782 | Jennifer | 19970218-178 | 2 Jennife | r | | | |
| 19970218-1782 | Paul | 19970218-178 | 2 Paul | | | | |
| 19990721-1222 | Jennifer | 19990721-122 | 2 Jennife | r | | | |
| LINKÖPING UNIVERSITY | Database Technology Topic 2: Relational Databases | | | 13 | Dutabase Technology UNIVERSITY Topic 2: Relational Dutabases | | |
| Referential I | ntegrity Co | onstraints (N | Aotivatio | n) | Referential Integrity Constraints | | |
| Consider the fe | llowing two role: | tiono | | | Maintaine consistency among tuples in two relations | | |
| | nowing two relat | | | | Maintains consistency among tuples in two relations Allows every tuple in one relation to refer to a tuple in another | | |
| Student PN | Name | Grade | StPN | Grade | Anows every tuple in one relation to refer to a tuple in another | | |
| 19970218-1782 | Jennifer | | 19970218-1782 | A | Formally: Let BK be the primary key in a relation B1 | | |
| 19951223-6512 | Paul | TDDD17 | 19970218-1782 | 5 | Let PK be the primary key in a relation R1 e.g., PK = { PN } in the Student relation on the previous slide | | |
| 19990721-1222 | Kim | TDDD43 | 19951223-6512 | 3 | Let FK be a set of attributes for another relation R2 | | |
| We may want to | o maka cura tha | t for over a studen | + | | e.g., FK = { StPN } in the Grade relation on the previous slide | | |
| for which we re | cord grades (in | the Grade relation | ເ ນ | | • The attribute(s) <i>FK</i> have the same domain(s) as the attribute(s) <i>PK</i> | | |
| we have a reco | ord in the Studen | it relation | ., | | Constraint: For every tuple t2 in R2, either | | |
| That is, assumi | ng the given ins | tance of the Stud | ent | | i) there is a tuple t1 in R1 such that the value that t1 has for PK is the same as the value that t2 has for FK or | | |
| relation, it woul | d be invalid to h | ave the following | tuple | | ii) the value that t^2 has for <i>FK</i> is NULL | | |
| in the Grade re | lation: | 7 20010210 6670 | | | • e.g., for every tuple t2 in the Grade relation, there is a tuple t1 in the Stu | | |
| | (IDDD1) | 7, 20010219-6678 | 5,4) | | relation such that the PN value of <i>t1</i> is the same as the StPN value of <i>t2</i> the StPN value of <i>t2</i> is NULL | | |
| | Database Technology Topic 2: Relational Databases | | | 15 | LINKOPING Database Technology UNIVERSITY Topic 2: Relational Databases | | |
| Diagrammin | ig Referent | ial Constrai | nts | | | | |
| Chow oach role | otional achoma | | | | | | |
| Show each fela | auonai schema | utos in cach | | | | | |
| Diroctod oro fr | mary key alli Di | utes ill edull | tion it referer | | | | |
| | Jin each luielg | | | 1623 | | | |
| Fname Minit Lname | Ssn Bdate Address Sex | Salary Super_ssn Dno | | | | | |
| DEDADTMENT | ssn Mgr start date | | | | | | |
| Dname Dnumber Mor | | + | | | | | |
| | | | | | www.liu.se | | |
| Department Mgr_ | | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT | | | | 1 | | | |
| Drame Drumber Mgr. DEPT_LOCATIONS Drumber Diocation PROJECT Pname Pnumber Ploca | tion Dnum | | | | | | |
| Department Mgr. | tion Dnum | | | | | | |
| Dependent | tion Dnum | Figure 3.7 | displayed | | | | |
| Dependent merit Dependent period Dependent period PROJECT Phame Phumber Plocation PROJECT Phame Phumber Ploca WORKS ON Easn Pho Hours DEPENDENT Easn Dependent_name | ition Dnum | Figure 3.7 Referential integrity constraints on the COMPANY relational dat schema. | displayed abase | | | | |