On the Succinctness of Query Rewriting for Datalog[±]

Shqiponja Ahmetaj¹ Andreas Pieris²

¹Institute of Logic and Computation, TU Wien, Austria ²School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Foundational Challenges in Data and Knowledge Management, Vienna, March 23, 2018

Ontology-Based Query Answering



 $Certain-Answers(\textbf{q}, \, D, \, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \ = \ \{ \, (\textbf{c}_1, \ldots, \textbf{c}_n) \in dom(D)^n \ \mid \ D \, \land \, \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \vDash \textbf{q}(\textbf{c}_1, \ldots, \textbf{c}_n) \, \}$

Ontology-Mediated Queries





Scalable OMQ Evaluation



Exploit standard RDBMSs - efficient technology for answering queries

Query Rewriting



a query that can be executed by exploiting existing database technology

for every database D : Q(D) = Q_{rew}(D)

Query Rewriting: An Example

{ $\forall x (Person(x) \rightarrow \exists y HasFather(x,y) \land Person(y))$ }



 $Q_{rew} = \exists x (Person(x) \land HasFather(John,x)) \lor Person(John)$

Query Rewritability



Definition: An OMQ language O is QL-Rewritable if every $Q \in O$ is QL-Rewritable First-order (FO), \exists FO⁺, Non-recursive Datalog (NDL), UCQ or Datalog

Query Rewritability: The Main Questions

1. Can we isolate meaningful OMQ languages that are QL-Rewritable?

2. What is the price of QL-rewriting?

...have been extensively studied for DL- and rule-based OMQ languages

Tuple-Generating Dependencies (TGDs)

(a.k.a. existential rules or Datalog \pm rules)

 $\forall \mathbf{x} \forall \mathbf{y} \ (\varphi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z} \ \psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}))$

(TGD,CQ)

The Guarded Family

Weakly-Guarded

one body-atom contains all the harmful ∀-variables

Guarded

one body-atom contains all the ∀-variables

$\mathsf{R}(\mathsf{w}), \varphi(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}) \to \exists \mathsf{z} \ \psi(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{z}) \ - \ \mathsf{w} \subseteq \{\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{y}\}$

[Calì, Gottlob & Kifer, KR 2008, J. Artif. Intell. Res. 2013]

$\mathsf{R}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}), \, \varphi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \, \rightarrow \, \exists \mathbf{z} \, \psi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z})$

[Calì, Gottlob & Kifer, KR 2008, J. Artif. Intell. Res. 2013]

Linear

one body-atom

$\mathsf{R}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}) \rightarrow \exists \mathbf{z} \ \psi(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{z})$

[Calì, Gottlob & Lukasiewicz, PODS 2009, J. Web Sem. 2012]

The Guarded Family

Theorem: It holds that

- 1. (Linear,CQ) is UCQ-Rewritable
- 2. (**Guarded**,**CQ**) is not FO-Rewritable, but is Datalog-Rewritable
- 3. (Weakly-Guarded,CQ) is not Datalog-Rewritable

(Guarded, CQ) is not FO-Rewritable

 $\mathsf{Q} = (\{\mathsf{R}(\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}), \, \mathsf{P}(\mathsf{y}) \to \mathsf{P}(\mathsf{x})\}, \ \mathsf{P}(\mathsf{c}_{\mathsf{n}}))$

 $D \supseteq \{P(c_1)\}$, and contains no other P-atom



(Weakly-Guarded, CQ) is not Datalog-Rewritable

Evaluation of (Weakly-Guarded,CQ) queries is

EXPTIME-complete in data complexity

...in fact, (Weakly-Guarded^{¬stratified},CQ) = EXPTIME, even w/o an order [Gottlob, Rudolph & Šimkus, PODS 2014]

The Guarded Family

Theorem: It holds that

- 1. (Linear,CQ) is UCQ-Rewritable
- 2. (**Guarded**,**CQ**) is not FO-Rewritable, but is Datalog-Rewritable
- 3. (Weakly-Guarded,CQ) is not Datalog-Rewritable

The Guarded Family

Theorem: It holds that

- 1. (Linear,CQ) is UCQ-Rewritable
- 2. (Guarded,CQ) is not FO-Rewritable, but is Datalog-Rewritable
- 3. (Weakly-Guarded,CQ) is not Datalog-Rewritable

(Linear, CQ) is UCQ-Rewritable

Via a resolution-based algorithm - XRewrite

```
ALGORITHM 1: The algorithm XRewrite
Input: a CQ q over a schema \mathcal{R} and a set \Sigma of TGDs over \mathcal{R}
Output: the perfect rewriting of q w.r.t. \Sigma
i := 0;
\boldsymbol{Q}_{\text{REW}} := \{ \langle \boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{\mathsf{r}}, \boldsymbol{\mathsf{u}} \rangle \};
repeat
       Q_{\text{TEMP}} := Q_{\text{REW}};
      foreach (q, x, u) \in Q_{\text{TEMP}}, where x \in \{r, f\} do
                                                                                               applicability condition for TGDs
            foreach \sigma \in \Sigma do
                    /* rewriting step
                   foreach S \subseteq body(q) such that \sigma is applicable to S do
                         i := i + 1:
                         q' := \gamma_{S,\sigma^i}(q[S/body(\sigma^i)]);
                         if there is no \langle q'', \mathsf{r}, \star \rangle \in Q_{\text{REW}} such that q' \simeq q'' then
                                \boldsymbol{Q}_{\text{REW}} := \boldsymbol{Q}_{\text{REW}} \cup \{\langle \boldsymbol{q}', \boldsymbol{\mathsf{r}}, \boldsymbol{\mathsf{u}} \rangle\};
                         end
                                                                                        apply useful reduction steps, but only useful ones
                   end
                   /* factorization step
                   foreach S \subset body(q) which is factorizable w.r.t. \sigma do
                         q' := \gamma_S(q);
                         if there is no \langle q'', \star, \star \rangle \in Q_{\text{REW}} such that q' \simeq q'' then
                                \boldsymbol{Q}_{\text{REW}} := \boldsymbol{Q}_{\text{REW}} \cup \{\langle q', \mathsf{f}, \mathsf{u} \rangle\};
                         end
                   end
            end
            /* query q is now explored
             Q_{\text{REW}} := (Q_{\text{REW}} \setminus \{ \langle q, x, \mathsf{u} \rangle \}) \cup \{ \langle q, x, \mathsf{e} \rangle \};
      end
until Q_{\text{TEMP}} = Q_{\text{REW}};
Q_{\text{FIN}} := \{q \mid \langle q, \mathsf{r}, \mathsf{e} \rangle \in Q_{\text{REW}}\};
return Q_{\text{FIN}}
```

(Linear, CQ) is UCQ-Rewritable

Via a resolution-based algorithm - XRewrite

Given an OMQ Q = (Σ, q) from (Linear, CQ)

- 1. The height of XRewrite(Q) is at most |q|
- 2. The size of XRewrite(Q) is at most $\#pred(\Sigma)^{|q|} \cdot (arity(\Sigma) \cdot |q|)^{arity(\Sigma) \cdot |q|}$

worst-case optimal

[Gottlob, Orsi & P., ICDE 2011, ACM Trans. Database Syst. 2014]

Lower Bound for (Linear, CQ)

 $\Sigma = \{\mathsf{R}_i(x) \to \mathsf{P}_i(x)\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \qquad q = \exists x \ (\mathsf{P}_1(x) \land \dots \land \mathsf{P}_n(x))$



 \Rightarrow we need to consider 2ⁿ disjuncts

Target More Succinct Query Languages

Theorem: For (Linear, CQ) there is

- No ∃FO⁺/NDL-rewriting of polynomial size
- No FO-rewriting of polynomial size (unless the PH collapses)

Proof: Via succinctness of monotone Boolean circuits

NOTE: The above proof exploits databases with a single domain element

Two Domain Elements





Polynomial Rewritings

... assuming two domain elements

Theorem: A (Linear, CQ) query can be rewritten in polynomial time as:

- An $\exists FO^+/NDL$ query for bounded arity predicates
- An FO query for arbitrary signatures

Proof:

- Bounded arity signatures via the polynomial witness property
- Arbitrary signatures via proof generators

Polynomial Witness Property (PWP)

Definition: (L,CQ) enjoys the PWP if: there exists a polynomial pol(·) such that

for every $\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{\Sigma}, \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{x})) \in (\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{CQ})$, database D, and $\mathbf{t} \in \text{dom}(D)^{|\mathbf{x}|}$

 $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{Q}(D) \Rightarrow \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{t})$ can be entailed after pol($|\Sigma|, |\mathbf{q}|$) chase steps



Polynomial Witness Property (PWP)

Theorem: PWP $\Rightarrow \exists FO^+/NDL$ -rewritings constructible in polynomial time,

focusing on databases with at least two constants



Witnesses and Linearity



[Gottlob, Manna & P., IJCAI 2015]





Proof Generator

Proof Generator



Polynomial Rewritings

... assuming two domain elements

Theorem: A (Linear, CQ) query can be rewritten in polynomial time as:

- An $\exists FO^+/NDL$ query for bounded arity predicates
- An FO query for arbitrary signatures

Proof:

- Bounded arity signatures via the polynomial witness property
- Arbitrary signatures via proof generators

The Guarded Family

Theorem: It holds that

- 1. (Linear,CQ) is UCQ-Rewritable
- 2. (Guarded,CQ) is not FO-Rewritable, but is Datalog-Rewritable
- 3. (Weakly-Guarded,CQ) is not Datalog-Rewritable

[Bárány, Benedikt & ten Cate, MFCS 2013] + [Gottlob, Rudolph & Šimkus, PODS 2014]

(Guarded, CQ) is Datalog-Rewritable

Via inference rules - inspired by DLs

 $\frac{\alpha \to \beta \wedge A}{\alpha \to A}~A$ has no existential variables

	$\gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_2 \to \delta$ is a Datalog rule,
$\alpha \to \beta \gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_2 \to \delta$	h is a homomorphism from
$\overline{\alpha \wedge h(\gamma_1) \to \beta \wedge h(\delta)}$	γ_2 to β with $vars(h(\gamma_1)) \subseteq$
	$vars(\alpha)$.

$$\frac{\alpha \to \beta}{g(\alpha) \to g(\beta)} \ g: \mathsf{vars}(\alpha) \to \mathsf{vars}(\alpha)$$

(Guarded,CQ) is Datalog-Rewritable

Via inference rules - inspired by DLs

Given an OMQ $Q = (\Sigma, q)$ from (**Guarded**,**CQ**),

the size of the Datalog rewriting is at most $2^{(\#pred(\Sigma) \cdot \#body-vars(\Sigma)^{arity(\Sigma)})}$

worst-case optimal?

[Gottlob, Rudolph & Šimkus, PODS 2014]

Polynomial Rewritings

... assuming two domain elements

Theorem: A (Guarded, Full CQ) or (Guarded, Acyclic CQ) query over bounded

arity predicates can be rewritten in polynomial time as a Datalog query

Proof: Via types

- Build all possible types
- Mark "bad" types
- From marked types to Datalog rules that capture ground consequences

Tuesday, March 27, ICDT4: Logic and Dependencies

Wrap Up



Wrap Up



Open Problems



Thank You!