

Topics in Database Theory – Homework 2

1 Algebraic Identities

1. (0 points)

(a) Consider a multi-join query, a.k.a. full conjunctive query:

$$Q = R_1 \bowtie R_2 \bowtie \dots \bowtie R_m$$

Assume we compute the query by joining the relations one-at-a-time, in some order $R_{n_1}, R_{n_2}, \dots, R_{n_m}$ (this is called a left-deep query plan):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Out}_1 &:= R_{n_1} \\ \text{Out}_2 &:= \text{Out}_1 \bowtie R_{n_2} \\ &\dots \\ \text{Out}_m &:= \text{Out}_{m-1} \bowtie R_{n_m} \end{aligned}$$

Assume that each relation is *reduced w.r.t. the query's output*, meaning $R_i = R_i \bowtie Q$. Find a syntactic condition that ensures that Out_i is reduced w.r.t. the query's output:

$$\forall i = 1, m : \quad \text{Out}_i = \text{Out}_i \bowtie Q$$

Use algebraic identities of \bowtie and \bowtie to prove that Out_i is reduced for all i . This will complete the proof of Claim 2 in the lecture notes, proving that Yannakakis' algorithm runs in time $O(|\text{Input}| + |\text{Output}|)$.

Hint: you need to use the algebraic identities discussed in class, plus possibly new ones that you need to discover.

(b) Suggested min-research project: use the equality saturation system egg <https://egraphs-good.github.io/> and prove correctness and the runtime of Yannakakis algorithm.

2 (Hyper)-Treewidth

2. (0 points)

(a) For each query below indicate whether they are acyclic.

$$Q_1 = R(X, Y) \wedge S(Y, Z) \wedge T(Z, X)$$

$$Q_2 = R(X, Y, Z) \wedge S(Y, Z, U) \wedge T(Z, U, V)$$

$$Q_3 = A(X, Y, Z) \wedge R(X, Y) \wedge S(Y, Z) \wedge T(Z, X)$$

$$Q_4 = A(X) \wedge B(Y) \wedge C(Z) \wedge R(X, Y) \wedge S(Y, Z) \wedge T(Z, X)$$

- (b)
- i. What is the treewidth of a cycle of length n ?
 - ii. What is the treewidth of an $n \times n$ grid? Node (i, j) is connected to $(i \pm 1, j)$ and to $(i, j \pm 1)$.
 - iii. What is the treewidth of an $n \times n \times n$ cube? Node (i, j, k) is connected to $(i \pm 1, j, k)$, $(i, j \pm 1, k)$, $(i, j, k \pm 1)$.

3 Query Containment

3. (0 points)

All queries below are Boolean conjunctive queries; the quantifiers \exists are dropped to reduce clutter.

(a) Indicate all containment or equivalence relationships between the following queries:

$$Q_1 = R(x, y) \wedge R(z, y) \wedge R(x, u)$$

$$Q_2 = R(x, y) \wedge R(y, z) \wedge R(z, u)$$

$$Q_3 = R(x, y) \wedge R(y, z) \wedge R(z, x)$$

$$Q_4 = R(x, y)$$

(b) Indicate all containment or equivalence relationships between the following queries:

$$Q_1 = R(x, y) \wedge R(y, z) \wedge R(z, x)$$

$$Q_2 = R(x, y) \wedge R(y, z) \wedge R(z, x) \wedge x \geq y$$

$$Q_3 = R(x, y) \wedge R(y, z) \wedge R(z, x) \wedge x \leq y \leq z$$

(c) [1] Prove that $Q_1 \equiv Q_2$:

$$Q_1 = R(x_1, x_2) \wedge R(x_2, x_3) \wedge R(x_3, x_4) \wedge R(x_4, x_5) \wedge R(x_5, x_1) \wedge x_1 \neq x_2$$

$$Q_2 = R(x_1, x_2) \wedge R(x_2, x_3) \wedge R(x_3, x_4) \wedge R(x_4, x_5) \wedge R(x_5, x_1) \wedge x_1 \neq x_3$$

References

- [1] Y. Amsterdamer, D. Deutch, T. Milo, and V. Tannen. On provenance minimization. In M. Lenzerini and T. Schwentick, editors, *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS 2011, June 12-16, 2011, Athens, Greece*, pages 141–152. ACM, 2011.