Today's lab exercise is reviewing project model sub-milestone 2 -- your grade will be based on your reviews.

The purposes of these reviews include:
- getting some experience reading database models
- hopefully giving you each some useful feedback to use to improve your project database model

Working in pairs, for each model draft, study it, and fill out a copy of this review form.

You are encouraged to make notes on the model copy as well as on this review form.

You will get a certain amount of time per model, and you are expected to fill out as much of the form as you can.
- If you finish the form before the time is up, help another pair with their review.

NOTE:
- CONSTRUCTIVE, THOUGHTFUL COMMENTS ARE EXPECTED. REMEMBER that your comments will be given to the model creator.
  - If I notice or hear of any that are inappropriate, your lab exercise grade will be affected, and your project model sub-milestone 2 grade may be affected as well.
  - The model creator will receive comments to help them to revise/improve their project model draft, but I will not have had a chance to check these for correctness; please keep this in mind.

(Using this form to perform a self-review of your model would be a good idea, as well.)

* does model include:
  * ...entity classes? (circle one): YES  NO
  * do any look like they are really attributes, rather than true entity classes?

  * do any look like instances of an entity, rather than a true entity class?

  * do any look like single items rather than entity classes?
* does it look like supertype/subtype situations have perhaps been overlooked?

* are there any obvious entity classes missing?

* are there at least 5 significantly-different entity classes (remembering that a supertype and all of its subtypes count as 1 entity in this particular count)?
  
  (circle one): YES  NO

* do you have any other comments related to the entity classes depicted within this model?

* ...relationships? (circle one): YES  NO

  * do the relationships use the required course notation (a line connecting the related attributes, with a diamond on that line, and there is a descriptive name for that relationship on or near the diamond)?
    
    (circle one): YES  NO

  * are the relationship names mostly unique?

  * are the relationship names reasonably descriptive?

  * do any of the relationships here look unnecessary (they should really be implied by other relationships instead)?

  * do the relationships shown involve appropriate entity classes?

  * do any significant relationships seem to be missing?

  * are there at least four reasonable relationships? (circle one): YES  NO

  * do you have any other comments related to the relationships depicted within this model?
* ...maximum cardinalities? (circle one): YES NO
* do these use the required course notation (a 1, M, or N near each relationship line connecting to an entity)? (circle one): YES NO
* are they included on both ends for every relationship?

* for each relationship -- do the cardinality constraints seem to be on the "correct" end, or do they seem to be reversed?

* for each relationship -- do the cardinality constraints seem reasonable? (if in doubt, suggest business rules that would make them reasonable)

* is there at least one reasonable 1:N relationship depicted? (circle one): YES NO
* is there at least one reasonable M:N relationship depicted? (circle one): YES NO
* do you have any other comments about this model's maximum cardinalities?

* ...minimum cardinalities? (circle one): YES NO
* do these use the required course notation (an oval on the relationship line near the entity class if a relationship is optional for that entity class, and a hash on the relationship line near the entity class if a relationship is mandatory for that entity class)? (circle one): YES NO
* are they included on both ends for every relationship?

* for each relationship -- do the minimum cardinalities seem to be on the "correct" end, or do they seem to be reversed?

* for each relationship -- do the minimum cardinalities seem reasonable? (if in doubt, suggest business rules that would make them reasonable)

* do you have any other comments about this model's minimum cardinalities?
* ...entity attribute lists? (circle one): YES NO

* are these given in **tabular** form (entity class name, with the attributes for that entity **underneath**)?
  (circle one): YES NO

* is at least one attribute **multivalued** (has an (MV) after its name)? (project requirement)
  (circle one): YES NO

* does it seem reasonable that the multivalued attribute(s) be multivalued?

* are attributes included for every entity class (except, perhaps, for subtype entity classes included for the sake of relationships)?

* are identifying attributes indicated on **most** of the lists? (remember, there are some entities -- for example, subtype entities, some association entities, and some weak entities -- for which identifying attributes are **not** applicable)

* are any relationship-related attributes included? (Remember, these lists are only showing **non-relationship-related attributes** of each entity. Entities are **not** tables, and they do **not** have foreign keys.)

* do the attribute lists seem to show signs of any "**missed**"/buried **relationships**?

* do the attribute lists seem to show signs of any "**missed**"/buried **entity classes**?

* do the attribute lists seem to show signs of any "**missed**"/buried **supertype/subtypes**?

* for each entity -- do the given attributes seem reasonable?

* do you have any other comments related to the **entity attribute lists** depicted within this model?

* Do you have any other comments that you would like to make about this model?