Subject: role names on association ends
Posted by Felix Prüter on Thu, 23 Jun 2016 13:16:45 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello,
I assume that all names on associations on the diagrams are role names.
If true, all these names should have a sigular or plural ending corresponding the related multiplicity.
e.g.
SpotLocation --> PositioningNetElement: 1 netElement
LinearLocation --> PositioningNetElement: 1..* netElements
ComposuitionNetElement --> ElementPartCollection: 0..* elementCollections

Kind regards
Felix
SIGNON Deutschland GmbH

Subject: Re: role names on association ends
Posted by christian.rahmig on Mon, 27 Jun 2016 08:54:22 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Felix,

Am 23.06.2016 um 18:18 schrieb Felix Prüter:
> Hello,
> I assume that all names on associations on the diagrams are
> role names.
> If true, all these names should have a sigular or plural
> ending corresponding the related multiplicity.
> e.g.
> SpotLocation --> PositioningNetElement: 1 netElement
> LinearLocation --> PositioningNetElement: 1..* netElements
> ComposuitionNetElement --> ElementPartCollection: 0..*
> elementCollections
> [...]

Your assumption is correct. And we should keep it the same in the all
the diagrams. However, in railML3 UML, the role name always describes
one instance. For the XSD export, this results then in sth like this:

```
<linearLocation>
  <netElement ref="..." />
  <netElement ref="..." />
</linearLocation>
```

Here, netElement is the UML role name.

Best regards
Christian

--
Christian Rahmig
railML.infrastructure coordinator

Subject: Re: role names on association ends
Posted by Felix Prüter on Mon, 27 Jun 2016 12:00:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi Chrisitian,

> And we should keep it the same in the all
the diagrams.

So the singular form should be used everywhere!?

Regards
Felix

Subject: Re: role names on association ends
Posted by Alain Jeanmaire on Fri, 07 Oct 2016 08:57:04 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear Felix,

to complete Christian's answer:

--> the best way is to use the singular or plural in accordance with the cardinality

Regards,
Alain Jeanmaire/Gilles Dessagne
SNCF Réseau