

DL-Lite Full: a sub-Language of OWL 2 Full for Powerful Meta-modeling (Appendix)

Zhenzhen Gu^a, Songmao Zhang^b

^aFaculty of Computer Science, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy

^bInstitute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

Appendix: Proofs of the theorems and lemmas in the manuscript

In the following, for **simplification**, we define $P(x, y)$ to be $P(x, y)$ if P is a name; and to be $S(b, a)$ if $P = S^-$ and S is a name.

Proof of Proposition 1

PROOF. (1. \Rightarrow) If \mathcal{K} is ν -satisfiable then obviously, \mathcal{K}' is ν -satisfiable. For each axiom α with the form:

$$B \sqsubseteq_c \neg \exists \text{type}, \quad B \sqsubseteq_c \neg \exists \text{type}^-, \quad P \sqsubseteq_r \neg \text{type}, \quad P \sqsubseteq \neg \text{type}^- \quad (\spadesuit)$$

$\text{ans}_\nu(\delta(\alpha), \mathcal{K}) = \emptyset$ holds. $\text{ans}_\nu(\delta(\alpha), \mathcal{K}') \subseteq \text{ans}_\nu(\delta(\alpha), \mathcal{K})$ holds trivially. Thus $\text{ans}_\nu(\delta(\alpha), \mathcal{K}) = \emptyset$.

(1. \Leftarrow) We show that each ν -model of \mathcal{K}' is also a ν -model of \mathcal{K} . \mathcal{K}' is satisfiable. Let \mathcal{V} be an arbitrary ν -model of \mathcal{K}' . For each disjoint axiom $\alpha : B \sqsubseteq_c \neg C$, where C is $\exists \text{type}$ or $\exists \text{type}^-$, $\text{ans}_\nu(\delta(\alpha), \mathcal{K}') = \emptyset$. Thus $\mathcal{V} \models \alpha$. For each disjoint axiom $\beta : S \sqsubseteq \neg R$ where R is type or type^- , we can similarly prove that $\mathcal{V} \models \beta$ holds. Thus \mathcal{V} is a ν -model of \mathcal{K} . Thus \mathcal{K} is satisfiable.

(2) Obviously, each ν -model of \mathcal{K} is also a ν -model of \mathcal{K}' . According to (1. \Leftarrow), each ν -model of \mathcal{K}' is also a ν -model of \mathcal{K} . Thus, for each MQ Q , $\text{ans}_\nu(Q, \mathcal{K}) = \text{ans}_\nu(Q, \mathcal{K}')$ holds. □

Proof of Lemma 1

PROOF. (1) \mathcal{K} is ν -satisfiable, thus it has a ν -model \mathcal{V} . From \mathcal{V} , we construct an interpretation \mathcal{I} of $\tau(\mathcal{K})$ by setting (a) $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} = \Delta^{\mathcal{V}}$; (b) for each $a \in \mathbf{N}$, $a^{\mathcal{I}} = a^{\mathcal{V}}$; (c) for each $A \in \mathbf{C}$, $A^{\mathcal{I}} = C^{\mathcal{V}}(v_c^-(A)^{\mathcal{V}})$; and (d) for each $P \in \mathbf{R}$, $P^{\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(v_r^-(A)^{\mathcal{V}})$, where v_c^- and v_r^- denote the inverse functions of v_c and v_r respectively. DL-Lite Full and DL-Lite_R follow the same principles to interpret the constructors of classes and roles. Thus we can get that $(\spadesuit) C^{\mathcal{V}}(C) = \tau_c(C)^{\mathcal{I}}$ for each DL-Lite Full class C and $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(R) = \tau_r(R)^{\mathcal{I}}$ for each DL-Lite Full role R . Then we can further obtain that \mathcal{I} satisfies all the axioms and assertions in $\tau(\mathcal{K})$. Thus $\tau(\mathcal{K})$ is satisfiable.

(2) If \mathcal{K} is not ν -satisfiable then this conclusion holds directly. Next, we assume \mathcal{K} is ν -satisfiable. Thus $\tau(\mathcal{K})$ is satisfiable. Let $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(\tau(Q), \tau(\mathcal{K}))$. Let \mathcal{V} be an arbitrary ν -model of \mathcal{K} . By the approach described in (1), a model \mathcal{I} of $\tau(\mathcal{K})$ can be constructed. Thus there exists a binding π of $\tau(Q)$ over \mathcal{I} such that $\mathcal{I}, \pi \models \tau(Q(\vec{u}))$ holds. From π , a binding π' of $Q(\vec{u})$ over \mathcal{V} can be constructed by setting $\pi'(x) = \pi(x)$ for each variable x of $Q(\vec{u})$ and $\pi'(a) = \pi(a)$ for each name a in $Q(\vec{u})$. Then by (\spadesuit) , we can further obtain that $\mathcal{V}, \pi' \models Q(\vec{u})$. Thus $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_\nu(Q, \mathcal{K})$ holds. Therefore, this direction holds. □

Email addresses: zhgu@unibz.it (Zhenzhen Gu), smzhang@math.ac.cn (Songmao Zhang)

Proof of Theorem 1

PROOF. Let $\tau^m(\mathcal{K}) = (\tau(\mathcal{T}), \tau(\mathcal{A}) \cup \mathcal{N}_1 \cup \mathcal{N}_2 \cup \mathcal{N}_3)$ where $\mathcal{N}_1 - \mathcal{N}_3$ are the sets of assertions obtained from the Step 1-3 respectively. Let $\mathcal{A}_1 - \mathcal{A}_3$ be the sets of assertions such that $\tau(\mathcal{A}_i) = \mathcal{N}_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Suppose:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_2 &= \{A_1(a_1), \dots, A_k(a_k)\} \\ \mathcal{A}_3 &= \{P_1(b_1, c_1), c_1(b_1), \dots, P_m(b_m, c_m), c_m(b_m)\} \quad \text{then:}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_2 &= \{v_c(A_1)(a_1), \dots, v_c(A_k)(a_k)\} \\ \mathcal{N}_3 &= \{v_r(P_1)(b_1, c_1), v_c(c_1)(b_1), \dots, v_r(P_m)(b_m, c_m), v_c(c_m)(b_m)\}\end{aligned}$$

And let $\mathcal{K}' = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_3)$. Then $\tau^m(\mathcal{K}) = \tau(\mathcal{K}')$ holds. And for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\tau(\mathcal{K}) \models \exists v_r(\text{type})^-(A_i)$, and for each $1 \leq j \leq m$, $\tau(\mathcal{K})$ entails $\exists v_r(P_j)(c_j)^-$ and $v_r(P_j) \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$. The corresponding individual assertions in \mathcal{N}_1 can also be entailed by \mathcal{K} . For example, if $A(a) \in \mathcal{N}_1$ then \mathcal{K} ν -entails $v_c^-(A)(a)$, since $\tau(\mathcal{K})$ entails $v_r(\text{type})(a, v_c^-(A))$. Thus here we do not give the concrete assertions in \mathcal{N}_1 .

(1. \Rightarrow) \mathcal{K} is ν -satisfiable, thus it has a ν -model \mathcal{V} . Obviously, \mathcal{V} satisfies the assertions in \mathcal{A}_1 . The satisfiability of $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$ can be proved by showing that \mathcal{K}' is satisfiable. Next, based on \mathcal{V} , we construct a model for \mathcal{K}' . a_1, \dots, a_k and b_1, \dots, b_m do not occur in \mathcal{K} . So we can assume that the class and role extensions of the interpretations of a_1, \dots, a_k and b_1, \dots, b_m are empty set, and the interpretations of a_1, \dots, a_k and b_1, \dots, b_m do not occur in the class and role extensions of other elements. Otherwise, we can make the following operation. Let $\{a'_1, \dots, a'_k, b'_1, \dots, b'_m\}$ be $n + m$ new elements not occurring in $\Delta^{\mathcal{V}} \cup \mathbf{N}$. In \mathcal{V} , set $\Delta^{\mathcal{V}} = \Delta^{\mathcal{V}} \cup \{a'_1, \dots, a'_k, b'_1, \dots, b'_m\}$, $a_i^{\mathcal{V}} = a'_i$ and $b_j^{\mathcal{V}} = b'_j$ as well as $C^{\mathcal{V}}(o) = \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(o) = \emptyset$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $o \in \{a'_1, \dots, a'_k, b'_1, \dots, b'_m\}$, while keeping the others unchanged. Then \mathcal{V} is still a ν -model of \mathcal{K} .

Next, based on \mathcal{V} , we construct a ν -model of \mathcal{K}' by making a copy of \mathcal{V} for each fresh name a_i and b_j and then merging these copies. For each $A_i(a_i)$, we know \mathcal{K} entails $\exists \text{type}^-(A_i)$. Thus there exists $(e_i, A_i^{\mathcal{V}}) \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(\text{type}^{\mathcal{V}})$. Similarly, for each $P_j(b_j, c_j)$ and $c_j(b_j)$, there exists $o_j \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}}$ such that $(o_j, b_j^{\mathcal{V}}) \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(P_j^{\mathcal{V}})$ and $(o_j, b_j^{\mathcal{V}}) \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(\text{type}^{\mathcal{V}})$. For each $\gamma \in \{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_m\}$, we make a copy $\mathcal{V}_{\gamma} = (\Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}, \cdot^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}, C^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}, \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}})$ of \mathcal{V} where (a1) $|\Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}| = |\Delta^{\mathcal{V}}|$, $\Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}} \cap \Delta^{\mathcal{V}} = \emptyset$ and there exists a bijective function $\delta_{\gamma} : \Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}} \rightarrow \Delta^{\mathcal{V}}$; (b1) for each $a \in \mathbf{N} - \{\gamma\}$, set $a^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}} = \delta_{\gamma}^-(a^{\mathcal{V}})$; and if $\gamma = a_i$ then set $a^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}} = \delta_{\gamma}^-(e_i^{\mathcal{V}})$, and if $\gamma = b_j$ then set $a^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}} = \delta_{\gamma}^-(o_j^{\mathcal{V}})$. and (c1) for each $o \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}$, $C^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}(o) = \{\delta_r(e) | e \in C^{\mathcal{V}}(\delta_{\gamma}(o))\}$ and $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}(o) = \{(e, e') | (\delta(e), \delta(e')) \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(\delta_{\gamma}(o))\}$. $o \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}$, $C^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}(o) = C^{\mathcal{V}}(\delta_{\gamma}(o))$ and $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}(o) = \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(\delta_{\gamma}(o))$. Then $(\spadesuit) \mathcal{V}_{\gamma}$ is also a ν -model of \mathcal{K} . For every different elements γ and γ' in $\{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_m\}$, we assume $(\clubsuit) \Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}} \cap \Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma'}} = \emptyset$.

From $\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}_{a_1}, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{a_k}, \mathcal{V}_{b_1}, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{b_m}$, we construct a new ν -interpretation \mathcal{V}' by setting:

- (a2) $\Delta^{\mathcal{V}'} = \Delta^{\mathcal{V}} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^k \Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{a_i}}) \cup (\bigcup_{j=1}^m \Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{b_j}})$;
- (b2) For each $a \in \mathbf{N} - \{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_m\}$, $a^{\mathcal{V}'} = a^{\mathcal{V}}$; for each a_i , $a_i^{\mathcal{V}'} = a_i^{\mathcal{V}_{a_i}}$; and for each b_j , $b_j^{\mathcal{V}'} = b_j^{\mathcal{V}_{b_j}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$
- (c2) For each $o \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}'}$, if there exists $a \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $o = a^{\mathcal{V}'}$ then $C^{\mathcal{V}'}(o) = C^{\mathcal{V}}(a^{\mathcal{V}}) \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^k C^{\mathcal{V}_{a_i}}(a^{\mathcal{V}_{a_i}})) \cup (\bigcup_{j=1}^m C^{\mathcal{V}_{b_j}}(a^{\mathcal{V}_{b_j}}))$ and $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}'}(o) = \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(a^{\mathcal{V}}) \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}_{a_i}}(a^{\mathcal{V}_{a_i}})) \cup (\bigcup_{j=1}^m \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}_{b_j}}(a^{\mathcal{V}_{b_j}}))$; otherwise, there exists $V \in \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}_{a_1}, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{a_k}, \mathcal{V}_{b_1}, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{b_m}\}$ such that $o \in \Delta^V$, then set $C^{\mathcal{V}'}(o) = C^V(o)$ and $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}'}(o) = \mathcal{R}^V(o)$.

By the setting (b1), we can get that \mathcal{V}' satisfies all the individual assertions in \mathcal{A}_2 and \mathcal{A}_3 . Then by (\spadesuit) and (\clubsuit) as well as the settings (a2) – (c2), we can get that \mathcal{V}' satisfies the axioms in \mathcal{T} and assertions in \mathcal{A}_1 . Thus \mathcal{V}' is a ν -model of \mathcal{K}' . From \mathcal{V}' , a model \mathcal{I} can be constructed for $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$ using the approach in the proof of Lemma 1. Thus $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$ is satisfiable.

(1. \Leftarrow) $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$ is satisfiable. Thus it has a canonical model \mathcal{I}^1 . Let $(e_1, a_1), \dots, (e_k, a_k)$ be all the elements in $v_r(\text{type})^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $e_i \notin \mathbf{N}$ and $a_i \in \mathbf{N}$. Let \mathcal{I}_{e_i} be a canonical model of $(\tau(\mathcal{T}), \{v_c(a_i)(e_i)\})$ (here e_i is treated as a name) for $1 \leq i \leq k$, where $(\spadesuit) (\Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cap \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{e_i}}) - (\mathbf{N} - \{e_i\}) = \emptyset$ and $(\Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{e_i}} \cap \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{e_j}}) - \mathbf{N} = \emptyset$ when $i \neq j$. From \mathcal{I} and $\mathcal{I}_{e_1} - \mathcal{I}_{e_k}$, we construct another interpretation \mathcal{I}' by setting (a1) $\Delta^{\mathcal{I}'} = \Delta^{\mathcal{I}} \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^m \Delta^{\mathcal{I}_{e_i}})$; (b1) for each $a \in \mathbf{N}$,

¹As shown in [7], a satisfiable DL-Lite_R KB \mathcal{O} has a canonical interpretation \mathcal{I} such that for each individual a , $a^{\mathcal{I}} = a$, and for each CQ q , $\vec{a} \in \text{ans}(q, \mathcal{O})$ iff $\mathcal{I} \models q(\vec{a})$.

$a^{I'} = a$; and (c1) for each $A \in \mathbf{C}$, $A^{I'} = A^I \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^m A^{I_{e_i}})$, and for each $P \in \mathbf{R}$, $P^{I'} = P^I \cup (\bigcup_{i=1}^m P^{I_{e_i}})$. Obviously, I' satisfies the individual assertions as well as positive inclusion axioms in $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$. Next, we show I' also satisfies the negative axioms in $\tau(\mathcal{T})$. Actually, we just need to check class disjoint axioms. For each $C \sqsubseteq \neg D \in \tau(\mathcal{T})$, suppose (♠) there exists $o \in C^{I'} \cap D^{I'}$. Then by the construction of I' , we can get that there exists e_i such that $o = e_i$, and $e_i \in C^I$ and $e_i \in D^{I_{e_i}}$ holds, or $e_i \in C^{I_{e_i}}$ and $e_i \in D^I$ holds, since $C^I \cap D^I = C^{I_{e_i}} \cap D^{I_{e_i}} = \emptyset$. Suppose $e_i \in C^I \cap D^{I_{e_i}}$. Then we can get that $\tau(\mathcal{K})$ entails $v_c(c_i) \sqsubseteq D$ and there exists role S such that $(e_i, c_i) \in S^I$ and $\tau(\mathcal{T})$ entails $\exists S \sqsubseteq C$ and $S \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$. Then there exists $S(b_i, c_i), v_c(c_i)(b_i)$ in \mathcal{A}_2 . And this contradicts with the fact that $\mathcal{K}_o = (\tau(\mathcal{T}), \{S(b_i, c_i), v_c(c_i)(b_i)\})$ is satisfiable, since \mathcal{K}_o entails $C(b_i)$ and $D(b_i)$. Thus assumption (♠) does not hold. Thus I' satisfies all the negative axioms in $\tau(\mathcal{T})$. Thus I' is a model of $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$. From I' , we construct a ν -interpretation \mathcal{V} for \mathcal{K} by setting (a2) $\Delta^{\mathcal{V}} = \Delta^{I'}$; (b2) for each $a \in \mathbf{N}$, $a^{\mathcal{V}} = a$; (c2) for each $o \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}}$, if $o \in \mathbf{N}$, then $C^{\mathcal{V}}(o) = o^{I'}$, otherwise $C^{\mathcal{V}}(o) = \{e | (e, o) \in \text{type}^{I'}\}$; and (d2) for each $o \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}}$, if $o \in \mathbf{N} - \{\text{type}\}$, then $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(o) = o^{I'}$, otherwise if $o = \text{type}$ then $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(o) = o^{I'} \cup \{(e, e') | e' \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}} \wedge e \in C^{\mathcal{V}}(e')\}$, otherwise $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(o) = \emptyset$. Next, we show \mathcal{V} is correctly defined by checking the interpretation of **type**, i.e., (♣) $\mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(\text{type}) = \{(e, o) | o \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}}, e \in C^{\mathcal{V}}(o)\}$ holds. For each $(e, o) \in \mathcal{R}^{\mathcal{V}}(\text{type})$, if $o \in \mathbf{N}$ then $e \in v_c(o)^{I'}$ holds, thus $(e, o) \in \{(e, o) | o \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}}, e \in C^{\mathcal{V}}(o)\}$ holds; otherwise $(e, o) \in \{(e, o) | o \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}}, e \in C^{\mathcal{V}}(o)\}$ holds directly. The other direction of (♣) holds directly. Thus \mathcal{V} is a ν -model of \mathcal{K} . \mathcal{V} and I' follow the same principles to interpret class and role constructors. Then by the construction of \mathcal{V} , we can get that \mathcal{V} satisfies all the axioms and assertions in \mathcal{K} . Thus \mathcal{K} is ν -satisfiable.

(2. \subseteq) Let $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_{\nu}(Q, \mathcal{K})$. Obviously \vec{u} does not contain the extra names in $N_2 \cup N_3$. Let I be a canonical model of $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$. From I , a ν -model \mathcal{V} can be constructed from an extension I' of I by the approach described in (1. \Leftarrow). Thus there exists a binding π of Q over \mathcal{V} such that $\mathcal{V}, \pi \models_{\nu} Q(\vec{u})$. From π , a binding π' of $\tau(Q(\vec{u}))$ over I can be constructed by setting $\pi'(x) = \pi(x)$ for each variable x in $\tau(Q)$ and $\pi'(a) = \pi(a)$ for each individual a in $\tau(Q)$. Then, $I', \pi' \models \tau(Q(\vec{u}))$ holds. In the construction of I' ((1. \Leftarrow)), for each $v_c(a_i)(e_i)$, there exists assertion $v_c(a_i)(o) \in N_2$ or $v_r(P_j)(b_j, a_i), v_c(a_i)(b_j) \in N_3$ such that $\tau(\mathcal{T}) \models \exists v_r(\text{type})^-(a_i)$ or $\tau(\mathcal{T}) \models \exists v_r(P_j)^-(a_i)$ and $v_r(P_j) \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$. This means that (★) there exists a mapping δ_{e_i} from $\Delta^{I_{e_i}}$ to Δ^I such that for each class $A \in \mathbf{C}$, $\{\delta(o) | o \in A^{I_{e_i}}\} \subseteq A^I$ and for each role $P \in \mathbf{R}$, $\{(\delta(o), \delta(e)) | (o, e) \in P^{I_{e_i}}\} \subseteq P^I$. Then from π' and the functions $I_{e_1} - I_{e_k}$, a binding π'' of $\tau(Q(\vec{u}))$ over I can be constructed by the settings that (a) for each individual a in $\tau(Q(\vec{u}))$, then set $\pi''(a) = a$; (b) for each variable x in $\tau(Q(\vec{u}))$, if $\pi'(x) \in \Delta^I$ then set $\pi''(x) = \pi'(x)$, otherwise there exists e_i such that $\pi'(x) \in \Delta^{I_{e_i}}$ then set $\pi''(x) = \delta_{e_i}(\pi'(x))$. Then based on (♦) (in (1. \Leftarrow)) and (★), $I, \pi'' \models \tau(Q(\vec{u}))$ holds. Thus $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(Q, \tau^m(\mathcal{K}))^-$ holds.

(2. \supseteq) Let $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(\tau(Q), \tau^m(\mathcal{K}))^-$. Next, we show that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_{\nu}(Q, \mathcal{K})$. Let \mathcal{V} be an arbitrary model of \mathcal{K} . From \mathcal{V} , we can construct a model \mathcal{V}' of \mathcal{K}' using the approach in (1. \Rightarrow). Then a model I of $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$ can be constructed from \mathcal{V}' using the approach described in (1. \Rightarrow). Thus there exists a binding π of $\tau(Q(\vec{u}))$ over I such that $I, \pi \models \tau(Q(\vec{u}))$. From π , a binding π' of $Q(\vec{u})$ over \mathcal{V}' can be constructed by setting $\pi'(a) = a^{\mathcal{V}'}$ for each name a in $Q(\vec{u})$ and $\pi'(x) = \pi(x)$ for each variable x in $Q(\vec{u})$. Then by the construction of I , $\mathcal{V}', \pi' \models Q(\vec{u})$ holds. \vec{u} does not contain the names not occurring in \mathcal{K} . Then by the construction of \mathcal{V}' (illustrated in (1. \Rightarrow)), we can construct a binding π'' of $Q(\vec{u})$ over \mathcal{V} by the setting that for name or variable x in $Q(\vec{u})$, if $\pi'(x) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}}$ then set $\pi''(x) = \pi(x)$, otherwise there exists $\gamma \in \{a_1, \dots, a_k, b_1, \dots, b_m\}$ such that $\pi'(x) \in \Delta^{\mathcal{V}_{\gamma}}$ then set $\pi''(x) = \delta_{\gamma}^{-1}(\pi(x))$. Then by the construction of these \mathcal{V}_{γ} , $\mathcal{V}, \pi'' \models Q(\vec{u})$ holds. From the arbitrary feature of \mathcal{V} , $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_{\nu}(Q, \mathcal{K})$ holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 2

PROOF. Suppose $\tau^m(\mathcal{T}) = (\tau(\mathcal{T}), \tau(\mathcal{A}) \cup N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3)$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1, Let $\mathcal{A}_1 - \mathcal{A}_3$ be the sets of assertions such that $\tau(\mathcal{A}_i) = N_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Let $\mathcal{K}' = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \mathcal{A}_3)$. Then $\tau^m(\mathcal{K}) = \tau(\mathcal{K}')$. It holds trivially that for each conjunctive query Q' and DL-Lite Full ABox \mathcal{A} , $\text{ans}_{\nu}(Q', \mathcal{A}) = \text{ans}(\tau(Q'), \tau(\mathcal{A}))$ holds.

(1. \Rightarrow) Suppose there exists $q \in \text{Violates}_{\nu}(\mathcal{T})$ such that $\text{ans}_{\nu}(q, \mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists a disjoint axiom $\gamma \sqsubseteq_l \neg\gamma'$ ($l \in \{r, c\}$) in \mathcal{T} , such that $q \in \text{PerfectRef}_{\nu}(Q, \mathcal{T})$, where Q is the query corresponding to $\gamma \sqsubseteq_l \neg\gamma'$. For example, if $\gamma \sqsubseteq_l \neg\gamma'$ is $A \sqsubseteq_c \neg B$, then Q is $A(?x) \wedge B(?x) \rightarrow q()$ where A and B are names. According to the algorithm PerfectRef_{ν} , $\text{ans}_{\nu}(q, \mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{ans}_{\nu}(Q, \mathcal{K})$ holds trivially. Thus $\text{ans}_{\nu}(Q, \mathcal{K}) \neq \emptyset$. This means \mathcal{K} entails that γ and γ' share some individuals. This contradicts with that \mathcal{K} is ν -satisfiable. Thus for each $q \in \text{Violates}_{\nu}(\mathcal{T})$, $\text{ans}_{\nu}(q, \mathcal{A}) = \emptyset$.

(1. \Leftarrow) Suppose (♠) \mathcal{K} is not ν -satisfiable. Then $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$ is not satisfiable. Then there exists a disjoint axiom in $\text{cl}(\tau(\mathcal{T}))$ (the negative closure of $\tau(\mathcal{T})$ defined in [7]), suppose it is $A \sqsubseteq \neg B$, such that (♣) $\text{ans}(q, \tau(\mathcal{A}) \cup N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3) \neq \emptyset$, where q is the query $A(?x) \wedge B(?x) \rightarrow q()$. From the algorithm Violates_{ν} , we can get that there exists $Q \in \text{Violates}_{\nu}(\mathcal{T})$ such that $\tau(Q) = q$. From (♣), we can also get that (a) $\text{ans}(q, \tau(\mathcal{A})) \neq \emptyset$; (bi) $\text{ans}(q, N_i) \neq \emptyset$

where $i = 1, 2, 3$, since N_1, N_2 and N_3 do not share any individuals; (c) $\text{ans}(q, \tau(\mathcal{A}) \cup N_1) \neq \emptyset$. If (a) holds, then obviously $\text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$. This contradicts with the condition that (C) for each $Q_o \in \text{Violates}_v(\mathcal{T})$, $\text{ans}_v(Q_o, \mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$. If (b1) holds, i.e., $\text{ans}(q, N_1) \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists individual a such that $A(a)$ and $B(a)$ in N_1 . Then from the construction of N_1 , $\tau(\mathcal{K}) \models v_r(\text{type})(a, v_c^-(A))$ and $\tau(\mathcal{K}) \models v_r(\text{type})(a, v_c^-(B))$ hold. Thus there exists $P_1(a, v_c^-(A))$ and $P_2(a, v_c^-(B))$ in $\tau(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\tau(\mathcal{T}) \models P_1 \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$ and $\tau(\mathcal{T}) \models P_2 \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$. According to PerfectRef_v , we can get that $q : v_r^-(P_1)(?x, v_c^-(A)) \wedge v_r^-(P_2)(?x, v_c^-(B)) \rightarrow q()$ in $\text{Violates}_v(\mathcal{T})$. Obviously, $\text{ans}_v(q, \mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$. This also contradicts with (C), thus (b1) does not hold. If (b2) holds, then $A = B$ must hold, since the assertion in \mathcal{A}_2 do not share individuals. From the construction of N_2 , $\tau(\mathcal{K}) \models \exists v_r(\text{type})^-(v_c^-(A))$. Then we can get that (d1) there exists $P(a, v_c^-(A)) \in \tau(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\tau(\mathcal{T}) \models \exists P^- \sqsubseteq \exists v_r(\text{type})^-$; or (d2) there exists $A'(v_c^-(A)) \in \tau(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\tau(\mathcal{T}) \models A' \sqsubseteq \exists v_c^-(\text{type})$. Then $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(v_c^-(A)(x) \rightarrow q(), \mathcal{T})$ where Q' is $v_r^-(P)(x, v_c^-(A)) \rightarrow q()$ if case (d1) holds and Q' is $v_c^-(A')(v_c^-(A)) \rightarrow q()$ if case (d2) holds. And $\text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$. This also contradicts with condition (C). Thus (b2) does not hold. Condition (b3) and (c) as well as other forms of the disjoint axioms can be validated similarly. Thus the assumption (\clubsuit) does not hold. Therefore \mathcal{K} is satisfiable.

(2. \supseteq) This direction holds directly according to the following two observations. (O₁) For two conjunctive queries Q' and Q'' , if Q'' is obtained from Q' by applying an inclusion axiom over an atom of Q' via the rule described in Algorithm 1, then it holds trivially that $\text{ans}_v(Q'', \mathcal{K}) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{K})$ holds. (O₂) For each conjunctive query Q' , $\text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{K})$. Combining (O₁) and (O₂), this direction holds trivially.

(2. \subseteq) Let $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K})$. Next, we show that (\clubsuit) there exists $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q, \mathcal{T})$ such that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{A})$. By Theorem 1, $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(\tau(Q), \tau^m(\mathcal{K}))$ holds. Thus there exists $q \in \text{PerfectRef}(\tau(Q), \tau(\mathcal{T}))$ such that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(q, \tau(\mathcal{A}) \cup N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3)$. Let Q' be the query such that $\tau(Q') = q$. Then $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q, \mathcal{T})$. If $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(q, \tau(\mathcal{A}))$ holds, then $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{A})$ holds directly. Otherwise let N'_1, N'_2 and N'_3 be the smallest sets of N_1, N_2 and N_3 respectively such that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(q, \tau(\mathcal{A}) \cup N'_1 \cup N'_2 \cup N'_3)$. Suppose:

$$\begin{aligned} N'_1 &= \{A_1(a_1), \dots, A_k(a_k)\} \\ N'_2 &= \{B_1(b_1), \dots, B_m(b_m)\} \\ N'_3 &= \{P_1(c_1, d_1), v_c(d_1)(c_1), \dots, P_l(c_l, d_l), v_c(d_l)(c_l)\} \cup \{C_1(o_1), \dots, C_n(o_n)\} \cup \{S_1(e_1, f_1), \dots, S_h(e_h, f_h)\} \end{aligned}$$

where (\clubsuit) b_i, c_j, d_l, o_h, e_d , and f_w are all different names and do not occur in $\tau(\mathcal{K})$. Then q is :

$$\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^j \alpha_i\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^k A_i(x_i^1)\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^m B_i(x_i^2)\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^l (P_i(x_i^3, y_i^3) \wedge v_c(d_i)(x_i^3))\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n C_i(x_i^4)\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^l S_i(x_i^5, y_i^5)\right) \rightarrow q(\vec{x})$$

Therefore Q' is the query:

$$\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^j \beta_i\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^k v_c^-(A_i)(x_i^1)\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^m v_c^-(B_i)(x_i^2)\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^l (v_r^-(P_i)(x_i^3, y_i^3) \wedge d_i(x_i^3))\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n v_c^-(C_i)(x_i^4)\right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^l v_r^-(S_i)(x_i^5, y_i^5)\right) \rightarrow q(\vec{x})$$

where $\tau(\beta_i) = \alpha_i$. Q does not contain the names not occurring in \mathcal{K} . Then according to (\clubsuit) , we can get that $(\spadesuit 1)$ x_i^2, x_j^3, x_l^5 and x_h^5 are non-bind variables; $(\spadesuit 2)$ y_i^3 is either d_i or is a non-bind variable; $(\spadesuit 3)$ $x_i^3 = x_i'^3$ or x_i^3 and $x_i'^3$ are both non-bind variable; $(\spadesuit 4)$ y_i^5 is either f_i or is a non-bind variable. Next, we construct a rewriting Q'' of Q' . Let $Q'' = Q'$. Then do the following operations:

- For each $A_i(a_i)$, $\tau(\mathcal{K}) \models v_r(\text{type})(a_i, v_c^-(A_i))$. Thus, there exists $R_i(a_i, v_c^-(A_i)) \in \tau(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\tau(\mathcal{T}) \models R_i \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$. Then replace $v_c^-(A_i)(x_i^1)$ in Q' with $v_r^-(R_i)(x_i^1, v_c^-(A_i))$;
- For each $P_i(c_i, d_i)$, $v_c(d_i)(c_i)$, there exists $P(e, d_i)$ (or $A(d_i)$) in $\tau(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\tau(\mathcal{T})$ entails $\exists P^- \sqsubseteq \exists P_i^-$ (or $A \sqsubseteq \exists P_i^-$) and $P_i \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$. Then replace $v_r^-(P_i)(x_i^3, y_i^3) \wedge d_i(x_i^3)$ in Q' with $v_r^-(P)(-, d_i)$ (or $v_c^-(A)(d_i)$); We explain one situation. Suppose there exists $P(e, d_i) \in \tau(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\tau(\mathcal{T})$ entails $\exists P^- \sqsubseteq \exists P_i^-$ and $P_i \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$. Then the expression $v_r^-(P_i)(x_i^3, y_i^3) \wedge d_i(x_i^3)$ can be rewritten into $v_r^-(P_i)(x_i^3, y_i^3) \wedge v_r^-(p_i)(x_i'^3, d_i)$. Then according to $(\spadesuit 2)$ and $(\spadesuit 3)$, the rewritten expression can be unified into $v_r^-(p_i)(x_i^3, d_i)$. Then according to $\tau(\mathcal{T})$ entailing $\exists P^- \sqsubseteq \exists P_i^-$, thus $v_r^-(p_i)(x_i^3, d_i)$ can be further rewritten into $v_r^-(P)(-, d_i)$.
- For each $C_i(o_i)$, there also exists $P(e, v_c^-(C_i))$ (or $A(v_c^-(C_i))$) in $\tau(\mathcal{A})$ and role S such that $\tau(\mathcal{T})$ entails $\exists P^- \sqsubseteq \exists S^-$ (or $A \sqsubseteq \exists S^-$) and $S \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$. Then replace $v_c^-(C_i)(x_i^4)$ in Q' with $v_r^-(P)(-, v_c^-(C_i))$ or $v_c^-(A)(v_c^-(C_i))$;

- (d) For each $S_i(e_i, f_i)$, there also exists $P(e, f_i)$ (or $A(f_i)$) in $\tau(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\tau(\mathcal{T})$ entails $\exists P^- \sqsubseteq \exists S_i^-$ (or $A \sqsubseteq \exists S_i^-$) and $S_i \sqsubseteq v_r(\text{type})$. Then replace $v_r^-(S_i)(x_i^5, y_i^5)$ with $v_r^-(P)(-, y_i^5)$ (or $v_c^-(A)(y_i^5)$)

Obviously, $Q'' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q', \mathcal{T})$ and $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q'', \mathcal{A})$. $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q, \mathcal{T})$, thus $\text{PerfectRef}_v(Q', \mathcal{T}) \subseteq \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q, \mathcal{T})$ holds, and further $Q'' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q, \mathcal{T})$ holds. Thus this direction holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 3

PROOF. By Theorem 2, this theorem holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 4

PROOF. Let $\tau^m(\mathcal{K}) = (\tau(\mathcal{T}), \tau(\mathcal{A}) \cup N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3)$ where N_1, N_2 and N_3 are the sets of assertions obtained from Steps 1-3, respectively.

(\subseteq) Let $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K})$. Next, we show there exists $\theta \in \text{MVB}(Q, \mathcal{K})$ and $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{T})$ without class variables such that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{A})$ holds. Let \mathcal{V} be a v -model of \mathcal{K} constructed from a canonical model \mathcal{I} of $\tau^m(\mathcal{K})$ using the approach in the (1. \Leftarrow) direction of the proof of Theorem 1. Then there exists a binding π of $Q(\vec{u})$ over \mathcal{V} such that $V, \pi \models Q(\vec{u})$. Based on π , we construct a MV-Binding $\theta = (\theta_r, \theta_c)$ of Q over \mathcal{K} . For each role variable $?x$ of Q , if $?x$ occurs in the i -th position of \vec{u} , then set $\theta_r(?x) = \vec{u}[i]$, otherwise, we know $\pi(?x)$ is a name, then set $\theta_r = \pi(?x)$. For each class variable $?y$ of $[Q\theta_r]$, if $?y$ occurs in the i -th position of \vec{u} then set $\theta_c(?y) = \vec{u}[i]$, otherwise if $\pi(?y)$ is a name occurring in \mathcal{K} then set $\theta_c(?y) = \pi(?y)$. Let q be the query obtained by replacing each atom $P(x, y)$ in $Q\theta$ with $v_r(P)(x, y)$, each $A(x)$ in $Q\theta$ with $v_c(A)(x)$, and each $?c(x)$ in $Q\theta$ with $v_r(\text{type}(x, y))$, where $?c$ is a variable. Then $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(q, \tau^m(\mathcal{K}))$ holds. Thus there exists $q' \in \text{PerfectRef}(q, \tau(\mathcal{T}))$ such that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(q', \tau(\mathcal{A}) \cup N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3)$. According to the algorithm PerfectRef_v , we can get that there exists $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{T})$ such that $\tau(Q') = q'$. Similar to the proof in the (2. \supseteq) direction of the proof of Theorem 2, we can further get that there exists $Q'' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q', \mathcal{T})$ such that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q'', \mathcal{A})$. $\text{PerfectRef}_v(Q', \mathcal{T}) \subseteq \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{T})$ holds, since $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{T})$. Thus $Q'' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{T})$ holds. Thus this direction holds.

(\supseteq) Obviously, for each MV-Binding ϑ of Q over \mathcal{K} , $\text{ans}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{K}) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K})$. Besides, if a query Q'' is obtained from a query Q' by applying one rule (case) in Algorithm PerfectRef_v , then $\text{ans}_v(Q'', \mathcal{K}) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{K})$ holds. Moreover, for a query Q' , $\text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{K})$ holds. Then combining these three aspects, this direction of the equation in this theorem holds directly. \square

Proof of Lemma 2

PROOF. Under v -semantics, it holds trivially that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}(Q, (\emptyset, \mathcal{A}))$ iff there exists a function f such that f maps each variable in $Q(\vec{u})$ to a name in \mathcal{A} and all the atoms in $Q(\vec{u})f$ occur in \mathcal{A} . Then this lemma holds. \square

Proof of Lemma 3

PROOF. (1) We first prove the following equation:

$$\text{MVB}(Q, \mathcal{K}) = \bigcup_{\vartheta \in \text{PMVB}(Q, \mathcal{T})} \text{ePMVB}(\vartheta, Q, \mathcal{K})$$

(\supseteq) By Definition 5, i.e., the definition of extensions of partial MV-Bindings, this direction of the equation in this lemma holds. (\subseteq) Let θ be an arbitrary MV-Binding of Q over \mathcal{K} . Next, we construct a partial MV-Binding ϑ of Q over \mathcal{T} such that $\theta \in \text{ePMVB}(\vartheta, Q, \mathcal{K})$. For each role variable x of Q , set $\vartheta(x) = \theta(x)$ iff $\theta(x) \in N_{\mathcal{T}}^r - \{\text{type}\}$, and for each class variable x of Q , set $\vartheta(x) = \theta(x)$ iff $\theta(x) \in N_{\mathcal{T}}^c$. Then by Definition 5, $\theta \in \text{ePMVB}(\vartheta, Q, \mathcal{K})$ holds. Thus the direction (\subseteq) holds.

(2) According to the algorithm PerfectRef_v , we can get that (\spadesuit) for a conjunctive query q and atom $A(x)$ (resp. $P(x, y)$), if A (resp. P) does not occur in the right hands of any inclusion axioms in a DL-Lite Full TBox \mathcal{T} , then this

query atom will not be extended by the inclusion axioms in \mathcal{T} to generate new queries, i.e., it will be occur in the queries in $\text{PerfectRef}(q, \mathcal{T})$. Next, we prove the following inclusions:

$$\bigcup_{\theta \in \text{PMVB}(\vartheta, Q, \mathcal{K})} \text{ans}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{K}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{T})} \text{ans}_v(Q', (\emptyset, \mathcal{A})) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K})$$

(\subseteq .1) Let $\theta \in \text{ePMVB}(\vartheta, Q, \mathcal{K})$ and $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{K})$. We show that there exists $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{T})$ such that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q', (\emptyset, \mathcal{A}))$. By Theorem 2, there exists $q \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{T})$ such that $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(q, \mathcal{A})$. Let $\theta' = (\theta'_r, \theta'_c)$ be a function satisfying that (a) $\text{dom}(\theta'_r) = \text{dom}(\theta_r) - \text{dom}(\vartheta_r)$ and for each $x \in \text{dom}(\theta'_r)$, $\theta'_r(x) = \theta_r(x)$ holds; and (b) $\text{dom}(\theta'_c) = \text{dom}(\theta_c) - \text{dom}(\vartheta_c)$ and for each $x \in \text{dom}(\theta'_c)$, $\theta'_c(x) = \theta_c(x)$ holds;. Obviously θ' is a MV-Binding of $Q\vartheta$ over \mathcal{K} that maps the class (resp. role) variables of $Q\vartheta$ to the names not occurring in $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{T}}^c$ (resp. $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{T}}^r$). For q , by (\spadesuit) and the Definitions of PerfectRef_v , we can get that there exists $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{T})$ such that $q = Q'\theta'$. Thus $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q'\theta', \mathcal{A})$. Then $\vec{u} \in \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{A})$ holds trivially. Thus the first inclusion holds.

(\subseteq .2) For the partial MV-binding, $\text{ans}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{K}) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K})$ holds trivially. Besides, for each query Q'' obtained from a query Q' by applying an inclusion axiom over one atom of Q' or by unifying two atoms of Q' using the way illustrated in algorithm PerfectRef_v , then $\text{ans}_v(Q'', \mathcal{K}) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{K})$ holds. Thus for each $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{K})$, $\text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{K}) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{K})$ holds. Moreover, for each $Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{K})$, $\text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q', \mathcal{K})$. Then combining these three aspects, the second inclusion holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 5

PROOF. For the MQ Q , KB $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A})$ and partial MV-binding ϑ_o of Q over \mathcal{T} , Lemma 3 indicates the following relations (a1) – (a2):

$$\text{MVB}(Q, \mathcal{K}) = \bigcup_{\vartheta \in \text{PMVB}(Q, \mathcal{T})} \text{ePMVB}(\vartheta, Q, \mathcal{K}) \quad (a1)$$

$$\bigcup_{\theta \in \text{ePMVB}(\vartheta_o, Q, \mathcal{K})} \text{ans}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{K}) \subseteq \bigcup_{Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta_o, \mathcal{T})} \text{ans}_v(Q', (\emptyset, \mathcal{A})) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K}) \quad (a2)$$

Obviously, $\text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K}) = \bigcup_{\theta \in \text{MVB}(Q, \mathcal{K})} \text{ans}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{K})$ holds. Then by the above equations and inclusions, we can get the following equations and inclusions (b1) – (b3):

$$\text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K}) = \bigcup_{\vartheta \in \text{PMVB}(Q, \mathcal{T})} \bigcup_{\theta \in \text{ePMVB}(\vartheta, Q, \mathcal{K})} \text{ans}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{K}) \quad (b1)$$

$$\bigcup_{\vartheta \in \text{PMVB}(Q, \mathcal{T})} \bigcup_{\theta \in \text{ePMVB}(\vartheta, Q, \mathcal{K})} \text{ans}_v(Q\theta, \mathcal{K}) \subseteq \bigcup_{\vartheta \in \text{PMVB}(Q, \mathcal{T})} \bigcup_{Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{T})} \text{ans}_v(Q', (\emptyset, \mathcal{A})) \quad (b2)$$

$$\bigcup_{\vartheta \in \text{PMVB}(Q, \mathcal{T})} \bigcup_{Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{T})} \text{ans}_v(Q', (\emptyset, \mathcal{A})) \subseteq \text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K}) \quad (b3)$$

Combing the above inclusion and equation relationships, the following equation holds:

$$\text{ans}_v(Q, \mathcal{K}) = \bigcup_{\vartheta \in \text{PMVB}(Q, \mathcal{T})} \bigcup_{Q' \in \text{PerfectRef}_v(Q\vartheta, \mathcal{T})} \text{ans}_v(Q', (\emptyset, \mathcal{A}))$$

Thus, the equation in this theorem holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 6

PROOF. CQ answering over databases has AC_0 data complexity. By Lemma 2, we can get that MQ answering over DL-Lite Full ABox has AC_0 data complexity.

If Q has meta-variables, then it has no more than $2^{2|Q|}(2|\mathcal{T}| + 2)^{2|Q|}$ partial MV-Bindings over \mathcal{T} . Then by Theorem 5, Definitions 4 and Lemma 4, the complexity results for meta-query answering holds. \square